

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 18, 1989

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Lamar N. Denkins, pastoral counselor, Anniston, AL, offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God! The Psalmist in the Old Testament cried for all creation to be still and know that You are God. The Founding Fathers of our Nation had the wisdom to acknowledge Your presence in the early providence of our Nation.

Today as this session begins we continue that great tradition and ask Your divine favor upon the deliberations of this day.

On this special day the people of the Third District of Alabama will take the mantle the late Congressman Bill Nichols wore with great distinction and pass it to Congressman-elect GLEN BROWDER. May a special dispensation of divine grace be upon him as he accepts this special trust bestowed by his constituents.

In the name of the Heavenly Father we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 102, answered "present" 2, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—290

Ackerman	Atkins	Bevill
Akaka	AuCoin	Billbray
Alexander	Barnard	Boggs
Anderson	Bateman	Bonior
Andrews	Bates	Borski
Anthony	Bellenson	Bosco
Applegate	Bennett	Boxer
Archer	Bereuter	Brennan
Aspin	Berman	Brooks

Broomfield	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Hopkins	Pickle
Bruce	Houghton	Porter
Bryant	Hoyer	Poshard
Bustamante	Hubbard	Price
Byron	Huckaby	Pursell
Callahan	Hughes	Quillen
Campbell (CA)	Hutto	Rahall
Campbell (CO)	Jenkins	Rangel
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Ravenel
Carper	Johnston	Ray
Carr	Jones (GA)	Regula
Chapman	Jones (NC)	Richardson
Clarke	Jontz	Rinaldo
Coelho	Kanjorski	Ritter
Coleman (MO)	Kaptur	Robinson
Coleman (TX)	Kasich	Roe
Collins	Kastenmeier	Rohrabacher
Combest	Kennedy	Rose
Conte	Kennelly	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Kildee	Rowland (CT)
Costello	Kleczka	Rowland (GA)
Coyne	Kostmayer	Roybal
Crockett	LaFalce	Russo
Darden	Lancaster	Sabo
Davis	Lantos	Saiki
de la Garza	Lehman (CA)	Sangmeister
DeFazio	Lehman (FL)	Sarpalius
Derrick	Leland	Savage
DeWine	Lent	Sawyer
Dicks	Levin (MI)	Saxton
Dingell	Levine (CA)	Scheuer
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Donnelly	Lipinski	Schulze
Dorgan (ND)	Livingston	Schumer
Downey	Lloyd	Sharp
Duncan	Long	Shumway
Durbin	Lowe (NY)	Shuster
Dwyer	Luken, Thomas	Sisisky
Dymally	Manton	Skaggs
Dyson	Markey	Skeen
Early	Martinez	Skelton
Eckart	Mazzoli	Slattery
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Slaughter (NY)
Engel	McDade	Smith (FL)
English	McDermott	Smith (IA)
Erdreich	McHugh	Smith (NE)
Espy	McMillen (MD)	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McNulty	Smith (VT)
Fascell	Meyers	Smalz
Fawell	Mfume	Spence
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Feighan	Miller (WA)	Stallings
Fish	Mineta	Stark
Flake	Moakley	Stenholm
Flipppo	Mollohan	Stokes
Foglietta	Montgomery	Studds
Foley	Moody	Swift
Ford (MI)	Moorhead	Synar
Frank	Morella	Tallon
Frenzel	Morrison (CT)	Tanner
Frost	Morrison (WA)	Tauzin
Gallo	Mrazek	Thomas (GA)
Garcia	Myers	Torres
Gaydos	Nagle	Torricelli
Geddeson	Natcher	Towns
Gibbons	Neal (MA)	Trafficant
Gillmor	Neal (NC)	Traxler
Gilman	Nelson	Udall
Gingrich	Nowak	Unsoeld
Glickman	Oaker	Valentine
Gonzalez	Oberstar	Vento
Gordon	Obey	Visclosky
Gradison	Olin	Volkmer
Grant	Ortiz	Walgren
Guarini	Owens (NY)	Watkins
Gunderson	Owens (UT)	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Packard	Weiss
Hall (TX)	Pallone	Whitten
Hamilton	Panetta	Williams
Harris	Parker	Wilson
Hawkins	Patterson	Wise
Hayes (IL)	Payne (VA)	Wolpe
Hayes (LA)	Pease	Wyden
Hefner	Pelosi	Wyllie
Hertel	Penny	Yates
Hiler	Perkins	Yatron
Hoagland	Petri	

NAYS—102

Annunzio	Herger	Ridge
Armey	Holloway	Roberts
Baker	Hunter	Rogers
Ballenger	Inhofe	Roukema
Barton	Ireland	Schaefer
Bentley	Jacobs	Schroeder
Billakis	James	Schuetz
Bliley	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Boehert	Lagomarsino	Shays
Brown (CO)	Leach (IA)	Sikorski
Buechner	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Bunning	Lewis (FL)	Smith (MS)
Clinger	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Coble	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Denny
Coughlin	Machtley	(OR)
Courter	Madigan	Smith, Robert
Cox	Marlenee	(NH)
Craig	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
Crane	Martin (NY)	(OR)
Dannemeyer	McCandless	Snowe
Dickinson	McCollum	Solomon
Dornan (CA)	McCrery	Stangeland
Douglas	McEwen	Stearns
Dreier	McGrath	Stump
Emerson	McMillan (NC)	Sundquist
Fields	Michel	Tauke
Gallegly	Miller (OH)	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Molinari	Upton
Goodling	Murphy	Vucanovich
Goss	Nielson	Walker
Grandy	Oxley	Walsh
Hancock	Parris	Weber
Hastert	Pashayan	Wheat
Hefley	Paxon	Wolf
Henry	Rhodes	Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Clay	Matsui
------	--------

NOT VOTING—38

Bartlett	Green	McCurdy
Boucher	Hammerschmidt	Murtha
Burton	Hansen	Payne (NJ)
Chandler	Hatcher	Pepper
Clement	Horton	Roth
Cooper	Hyde	Schneider
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Dellums	Kolbe	Staggers
Edwards (OK)	Kolter	Vander Jagt
Florio	Laughlin	Weldon
Ford (TN)	Leath (TX)	Whittaker
Gephardt	Lowery (CA)	Young (AK)
Gray	Mavroules	

□ 1224

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] to come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Mr. GOSS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 17, 1989.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Glen Browder, Secretary of State, State of Alabama certifying that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on April 4, 1989, the Honorable Glen Browder was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress from the Third Congressional District of Alabama.

With great respect, I am,
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF ALABAMA

I, Glen Browder, Secretary of State, of the State of Alabama, having custody of the Great and Principal Seal of said State, do hereby certify that the pages hereto attached contain a true, accurate and literal copy of the proclamation issued by the Governor and the certificate issued by the Secretary of State regarding the Special General Election held in the Third Congressional District in the State of Alabama on Tuesday, April 4, 1989. The same appears on file and of record in this office.

STATE OF ALABAMA—PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas, a Special General Election was held in the Third Congressional District in the State of Alabama on Tuesday, April 4, 1989, for the purpose of electing a Representative to the United States Congress for the Third Congressional District in the State of Alabama; and

Whereas, Alabama Code Section 17-14-20 (1975) requires that all of the election returns sent to the Secretary of State must, within fifteen days after such election, be opened and counted in the presence of the Governor, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General, or two of them; and

Whereas, on Wednesday, April 12, 1989, said election returns so sent to the Secretary of State were, in the presence of the Governor, Attorney General, and the Secretary of State, opened and tabulated; and

Whereas, it appears from said tabulation that the votes cast in said election were as follows:

For Alabama Third Congressional District:

Glen Browder, Democrat, received 47,294.

John Rice, Republican, received 25,142.

Jim Corley (write-in), received 1.

Now, therefore, I, Guy Hunt, Governor of the State of Alabama, do hereby proclaim that the following person has been elected to the office named and is entitled to receive commission as such, that is to say:

For Alabama Third Congressional District.

Glen Browder (D).

THE STATE OF ALABAMA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

I, Glen Browder, Secretary of State, in accordance with Section 17-14-24 of the Code

of Alabama, 1975, do hereby certify that as shown by the returns of the Election on file in this office Glen Browder was elected Member of the United States House of Representatives for the Third Congressional District at the Special Election held in this state on Tuesday, the 4th day of April, 1989.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE GLEN BROWDER, OF ALABAMA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER**. This is a significant moment. Will the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable GLEN BROWDER, kindly step forward and take the oath of office.

Mr. BROWDER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The **SPEAKER**. Congratulations; you are a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE GLEN BROWDER

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to introduce our newest colleague, Congressman GLEN BROWDER, of Jacksonville, who will represent Alabama's Third Congressional District.

This is the district which our friend Bill Nichols served so faithfully until his death last December. We all know those are some mighty big shoes to fill and that no one can ever really take Bill Nichols' place.

But, I have the utmost confidence in GLEN BROWDER. In fact, he reminds me of Bill Nichols when he first came to Congress. He is soft spoken, but he has strong leadership qualities. He is a man of integrity who will dedicate himself to serving his constituents, his State, and his Nation.

Our newest Member. He taught political science at Jacksonville State University and served in the Alabama State Legislature. In 1986, he was elected to be Alabama's secretary of State and served in that post until now.

I know that GLEN BROWDER will be a most outstanding Member of Congress. I certainly look forward to working with him during the remainder of the 101st Congress and I hope that all my colleagues will take the opportunity to welcome him to Washington.

GLEN BROWDER: BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILE

Glen Browder has bridged the gap between classroom political science and real-world government.

As Professor of Political Science at Jacksonville State University for sixteen years, Dr. Browder taught thousands of Alabama college students the important principles of American democracy. Now as a U.S. Con-

gressman, Representative Browder plays a key role in America's governmental process.

Browder believes that his two careers have worked hand-in-hand. His years as a teacher have helped him understand the issues facing our country, and his service as a Congressman (and previously as Alabama's Secretary of State and a state legislator) has helped him appreciate the opportunities and responsibilities of political leadership.

"Leadership is not simply making bold decisions and giving orders. Political leadership means addressing public problems and then helping citizens deal with those problems. To do this, you have to use both the powers of your office and your own personal powers of persuasion; and you have to respect the views of those who represent different viewpoints. But, most importantly, you have faith in the collective 'goodness' of the people."

Browder's priority as Secretary of State was clean elections and progressive administration. He wrote and helped pass the Fair Campaign Practices Act (1988) which requires financial disclosure by elected officials, candidates, and political action committees; and he automated that constitutional office without additional taxpayer funds. As a state representative, Browder championed a variety of reform-oriented legislation. He promoted improvements in Alabama's election laws, and he was the primary sponsor of some major education reform legislation and a program which forces lawbreakers to pay compensation to innocent victims of crime.

Browder was born in Sumter, South Carolina, and attended Presbyterian College (B.A. in History) and Emory University (M.A. and Ph. D. in Political Science). His occupational background includes work as an investigator with the U.S. Civil Service Commission and Sportswriter for the Atlanta Journal. He came to Jacksonville State University directly from graduate school and has been a member of that institution since 1971. An active political scientist, he is currently on leave of absence without pay from JSU. He served one term in the Alabama House of Representatives (1982-86) prior to his election as Secretary of State (1987-89).

Browder, 46, and his wife, Becky, have been married for twenty-two years; and they are the parents of 14 year-old Jenny Rebecca. The family holds membership in Jacksonville First United Methodist Church and resides in Jacksonville.

I PLEDGE TO BEAR TRUE AND FAITHFUL ALLEGIANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BROWDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I take this oath with seriousness, with personal gratitude to my family, with commitment to the people of the Third District of Alabama, with reverence to our former Congressman and your colleague Bill Nichols, with great respect to this institution and with the request that the Members of this House help me, as this oath prescribes, to bear true and

faithful allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO ATTEND MEETING OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair appoints as members of the United States delegation to attend the meeting of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut, chairman;

Mr. FASCELL of Florida, vice chairman;

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana;

Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas;

Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota;

Mr. LAFALCE of New York;

Mr. KOSTMAYER of Pennsylvania;

Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan;

Mr. HORTON of New York;

Mr. STANGELAND of Minnesota;

Mr. MARTIN of New York; and

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 100-382, the Chair appoints the following individual on the part of the House as a member to the Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. Gordon Ambach.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restore the minimum wage to a fair and equitable rate, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2) "An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restore the minimum wage to a fair and equitable rate, and for other purposes," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

PROVIDING FOR PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES IN CEREMONIES MARKING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) providing for participation by delegations of Members of both Houses of Congress in ceremonies to be held in April 1989 in New York City marking the 200th anniversaries of the implementation of the Constitution as the form of government of the United States, the convening of the First Congress, the inauguration of President George Washington, and the proposal of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 96

Whereas the Constitution officially became the form of government of the United States on March 4, 1789;

Whereas the First Congress convened in New York City on March 4, 1789;

Whereas New York City served as the first capital of the United States;

Whereas George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in New York City on April 30, 1789;

Whereas while meeting in New York City, the first Congress passed legislation creating the executive departments of the Federal Government and the Federal court system; and

Whereas while meeting in New York City, the first Congress, under the leadership of Representative James Madison of Virginia, framed and proposed to the States the ten constitutional amendments known today as the Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the Minority Leaders and the Bicentennial Committee Chairmen of their respective Houses, are authorized and directed to appoint Members of their respective Houses to serve on a delegation of Members of the Congress, which will take part in ceremonies to be held in New York City in April 1989 commemorating the 200th anniversaries of the implementation of the Constitution as the form of government of the United States, the convening of the First Congress, the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States, and the proposal of the Bill of Rights as the first ten amendments to the Constitution, and shall invite the President to join the delegation in participating in the ceremonies.

(b) The specific planning of the ceremonies described in subsection (a) shall be coordinated directly with the Historian of the Senate, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Senate, and the Historian of the

House of Representatives, under the jurisdiction of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BOGGS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the participation by delegations from the House and the Senate in the ceremonies scheduled to be held in New York City the last weekend in April to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the Nation's first President and the implementation of our Government under the terms of the Constitution.

The resolution empowers the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the Republican leadership and the House and Senate Bicentennial Commissions, to designate delegations to participate in the New York City ceremonies later this month. Responsibility for coordinating this effort is vested with the House and Senate historians.

Legislation with virtually the same effect, with only a slight difference in wording, passed the House and Senate last year as House Concurrent Resolution 115. There were 162 House cosponsors and the vote in the House was 421 to 0. We must revisit this matter again this year because the delegation was not appointed during the 100th Congress, therefore the 101st Congress must give its approval.

I do not know how many of you watched television, heard the radio or saw the newspapers, but on Sunday there began a reenactment of George Washington's journey to the Federal Hall in New York City for his inauguration. It began at Mount Vernon and traveled through Alexandria and Georgetown last Sunday and Monday. The reenactment will conclude with the oath-taking in New York City on Sunday, April 30, and in related festivities sponsored by the New York Commission, there will be fireworks, concerts, and a tall ships flotilla.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been cleared with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and with the Republican leadership, and I ask unanimous consent for its approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1989

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restore the minimum wage to a fair and equitable rate, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DANNEMEYER

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DANNEMEYER, moves that the managers on the part of the House at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2, are hereby instructed to agree to section 204 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker and Members, one of the growing controversial matters that all of us must confront in this Congress is the growing awareness on the part of senior citizens of America that the catastrophic bill that we passed last year will assure a significant tax increase to be experienced by tens of thousands of senior citizens across this country. This motion that this Member from California has filed at the desk to instruct conferees will have the effect of permitting those of us in this House to go on record as supporting holding hearings on this subject during this Congress. That is what the thrust of this motion is all about.

The technical way of reaching that is to instruct our conferees to agree to a provision that was adopted in the Senate that expressly does not request the same thing, namely to hold hearings in the Senate. Our motion, this one now pending, asks that those hearings take place and accordingly this will be a means whereby we in this House have a chance to say that we would like to hold hearings on the implications of the catastrophic bill that is now a part of the law of this country.

□ 1240

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker it is my understanding that the gentleman from California is requesting that we instruct the conferees to agree to the section in the Senate bill which suggests that it is the sense of the Senate that the Senate Committee on Finance review Public Law 100-360, specifically including the financing mechanisms, and further that it is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Finance hold hearings on this issue.

While I do not know that it is the purpose of this body to direct the other body as to their procedures, I can see nothing wrong with that, and I would have no particular objection to directing the Senate, if that is what the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I think as has already been indicated, that the intention on this side of the aisle is to be able to express as best as we can at any rate not only the endorsement of the Senate decision to pass the amendment expressing their views that there ought to be hearings in regard to the passage last year of the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act, there ought to be those hearings in the Senate, but we believe that by inference, at any rate, we are expressing ourselves that that ought to be the case over here also in the House, although the words do not directly state that.

As one who has been relatively active in this area, I know that I do have a lot on my mind on the subject, and just about everybody I talk to here in the House on both sides of the aisle also seem to have an awful lot of points on their mind that they would like to express but let me just summarize very quickly my feelings, why I believe it is so very important that we do have hearings on the pros and cons of the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act.

The seniors all over America have had a good time now to look at the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act, and I think what they are saying to Members is that they have a lot of objections. They believe that the Catastrophic Act zeroed in on what at least they feel is one of the lowest priorities in terms of the expansion of Medicare. I have always felt we have three basic areas we can expand into, and that is first, hospital and physician coverage services, and then into the whole in-home health care area, and last but not least, the most important, of the highest priority, I should say, of seniors, long-term custodial nursing home care. Seniors believe that not only are they being asked to self-finance, they are being asked to do a lot more than that, they are being asked to subsidize for others. Congress, in fact, has placed a mandated benefits responsibility on the seniors of this country,

and what seniors are saying is that at least Members should have asked them where their taxes should be spent, that is, which area of Medicare should be expanded. I think most seniors will say, inasmuch as Medicare does now cover acute hospital care and physician services, and 70 percent of seniors do have coverage with employer-provided insurance and with Medi-Gap policies and since 10 percent have Medicaid coverage, it seems as though we ought to, that Congress ought to, when it thinks in terms of expanding Medicare, ought to be thinking of expanding in an area that is not covered by Medicare, that is, long-term custodial nursing home care. It is a practical matter. People simply cannot get insurance to cover it. So they are saying to Members that they think that the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act ought to be completely re-evaluated. They also believe that to have used the income tax as the basic way of having seniors self-finance, was unfair. The tax surcharge is a tax upon a tax, which means that every time that there is a change in the definition of what is taxable income, there is a double hit on seniors. So it is a matter that insofar as the income tax is concerned, it is, I think, one of the worst ways in which to have seniors self-finance an expansion of Medicare.

We have, Mr. Speaker, also breached every promise which we have made in passing the Tax Reform Act of several years ago, in 1986, when we took away from the seniors as well as many others, a lot of tax deductions, tax credits, and exclusions of income. We promised then not to raise the income tax rates. Yet, of all the people in this great land of ours, we have chosen to raise the income tax rates only upon senior citizens. That, I think, is not fair. We are asking the seniors as a practical matter, constituting roughly 40 percent of the beneficiaries here who are paying taxes under this act, that in effect, they will pick up about two-thirds of the cost. And we brought in a new program insofar as the prescription drug program is concerned, and already the HCFA has advised the Members of Congress that in their view the drug prescription program which does not even start until 1991, will at the end of 1991, be a half billion dollars in debt. By the end of 1993, will be \$4 to \$5 billion in debt.

Of course we see here what Congress is notoriously very good at doing, and that is always seemingly underestimating the amount of money that we are going to be spending upon various programs. Indeed, back in 1965, Congress estimated that the Medicare Program will be costing about \$8.8 billion, come 1990, and we are already over \$100 billion in the financing of Medicare. So, with all due respect to those who labored very hard and assiduously on

the passage of the Medicare Catastrophe Coverage Act, seniors are saying that they think it is only the beginning of unanticipated costs! And it is the middle-class seniors, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, who will pay! The very rich and the very poor through Medicaid can afford this. But not the middle-class seniors who have done everything we have ever asked them to do. They put aside money, for instance, so that they would not have to rely totally upon Social Security, and lo and behold, we turn around and we break our word in regard to the Income Tax Reform Act and zero in on them, and say seniors are elected to carry the basic cost of this new catastrophic care program. I believe we have a number of bills we ought to evaluate as alternatives to the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act. And I hope that all Members here in the House and certainly those who have labored hard in the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce who certainly deserve a lot of credit, will look long and hard at what the Senate has and is doing here and will take the very same steps and open up their committees to hear what seniors have to say about the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act.

□ 1250

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental problem, as we all probably recognize now, with the catastrophic health insurance. More accurately put, it is in fact catastrophic income tax to the elderly in the context that it is mandatory and in the context that the people are paying 3 to 4 times what the true value of the premium is worth, and in the context that many of the middle-class people who are paying it already have the same benefits if they are Federal employees.

There are many flaws with the theoretical approach to it. We return in effect to a progressive income tax technique that we supposedly left in 1986 because something like 50 brackets are involved when you pay a 50-percent surtax on a \$5,000 income. So really it is more like 20 percent of the elderly are carrying the basic part of the package. A husband and wife can pay up to \$1,600 as a premium for something that is of marginal benefit in comparison to something they could fund privately. It is sort of like taxing the homeless to pay for the homeless.

The retired people are the least able to pay this income tax surcharge. The reason I say it is a return to the old progressive income tax system is because of the elevated categories that are involved. So we can use the "duck" argument or use the "rose" argument, that a rose is a rose by any

other name. It is mandatory. It is in fact nothing more than a tax for at least three-quarters of the premium on the elderly. It is unfair.

I have had over 1,300 letters objecting to it in the State of Florida because we have a large elderly population there, and we had better believe that they understand it. They have sat down with a pencil and figured it out. Of course, they did not catch on to it immediately because it was billed as a way to fund nursing home care for their spouses, and they thought that was a great idea when it was initially sold to the public. But by the time the committee got through with it, it did anything but that for extended nursing home stays, and it wound up being a tax. I do not believe that was the intention of the Congress or the people who voted on it or even the committee.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, we made a mistake. Despite our intentions, we did not give the people what they wanted when we passed the Catastrophic Health Coverage Act. We have watched our offices fill with mail, heard the angry protests, and I cannot believe that there are any of us left who doubt that we committed a monumental blunder. The time and place to correct the blunder is here and it is now.

Consider what this law does and does not do:

First, this law does impose a huge tax on the elderly, a 15-percent surcharge;

Second, this law does not expand protection where it is needed most—long-term nursing home care;

Third, this law does single out those over 65 for additional taxes;

Fourth, this law does not benefit the vast majority of older Americans, only about 5 percent will ever use it;

Fifth, this law does play havoc with budget estimates, figures vary wildly; and

Sixth, this law does not really offer "catastrophic coverage," it doesn't cover many common medical costs.

I have held 12 town meetings in the last 3 months, and this issue has dominated every one of them. I can tell you Mr. Speaker, the people are not just disturbed, they are angry. They are angry that their well laid financial plans, decades of saving, could be obliterated by the cost of health coverage that they do not need or want. What do we say to the older Americans who can't afford our idea of proper health coverage? We should say we made a mistake and then take our hands off their wallets.

We should not be in the business of picking a health plan and forcing it on our constituents. And they should not have to take it. I have introduced a bill

with Congressman ROBIN TALLON to give people a choice, they can take this health plan or not. This is the right way, the American way.

If this health care coverage is as good as its sponsors suggest, they should not fear making it optional. If it's not good coverage then the people will let us know. In any event, we should not be telling older Americans what is best for them, they should be telling us.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, my district may be somewhat atypical because it has a great many senior citizens, but I think it is very fair to say that senior citizens throughout the country seem to be in accord that there are very devastating flaws in the well-intentioned catastrophic health bill. These flaws are clearly causing more harm than help to our senior citizens whose needs are still somewhat unmet, particularly in the area of long-term health care. Certainly it is not a formula that is equitable, and we owe it to our constituents to go back and make some changes. It is very fair to say that anxieties are extremely high. As far as I am concerned, the voice is loud, the voice is clear, and it says, "Fix the catastrophic health bill, please."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to correct this situation.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this body who does not now know how extremely unhappy the retired citizens of this country are with the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988. There is not a Member of this body who has not been told in loud, clear tones just exactly how unhappy those Medicare beneficiaries are, and there is not a Member of this body who has not been pleaded with to do something about it.

I want to suggest to the Members here that today it is possible to do something about it, and that is by supporting the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Reform Act of 1989, which was introduced today by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], by myself, and 27 other original cosponsors. That act seeks to remedy the worst features of the catastrophic act which we passed last year. It most specifically does repeal the income surtax that is the major financing mechanism of that act. Furthermore, it takes the most expensive and the potentially fiscally most disastrous provision in that act, the prescription drug benefit, out of Medicare. It elimi-

nates it entirely from Medicare and provides a prescription benefit from Medicaid for those who are most in need of this benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose there could be Members of this body who think the income surtax is fair, and that it is the proper way to finance this expansion of Medicare, but I urge Members, if they happen to think that, to look at the numbers which have been developed by the Health Care Financing Administration as it relates to the financing of the prescription drug benefit alone and says it is not enough. It is not enough by a little, it is not enough by a lot, by half a billion dollars in the second year of the program and by \$3.5 to \$4 billion in the third year of the program.

If we do not have an inequity in the financing, which I believe we do, we have a ticking time bomb in the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please take a good hard look at the Medicare Catastrophic Reform Act of 1989, because I think the message is clear. We should reform what we did, and this is a good mechanism to use to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following materials under leave to include extraneous matter:

RHODES INTRODUCES CATASTROPHIC CARE REFORM ACT OF 1989

The mail bags in Congress are overflowing with angry letters from senior Americans across the nation. The reason: senior Americans have begun to receive the bill for the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988. This is the new expansion of Medicare that many initially believed would cover all "catastrophic" medical expenses, including nursing home expenses. It was also going to reduce private sector MediGap policy premiums and guarantee that no senior American would pay more to the government for this coverage than to private sector insurers. As many of us predicted, however, seniors throughout the country are now paying higher Medicare premiums, higher taxes, and are being forced to drop MediGap policies which provide better protection than this expansion of Medicare. Moreover, because this program is mandatory, it forces many to pay for benefits they already enjoy from private and certain governmental retirement plans.

In order to fund the expanded Medicare benefits authorized in the 1988 Act, many Americans over the age of 65 must now pay an income surtax of \$22.50 added to every \$150 owed in regular incomes taxes. In essence, this is a "tax on a tax." To add to this financial burden, the new law increased the monthly Medicare premium by \$4 from \$27.90 to \$31.90. This year, 11 million senior Americans, 35 percent of all retirees, will be forced to pay the surtax. More alarming, the tax rate and the percentage of senior Americans paying the tax will continue to grow in the years to come. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that 14 million retirees, or 42 percent, will be paying the new surtax by 1993. This year, because of the surtax, senior Americans are paying an average of 15% more in income taxes than the rest of America. And, by 1993, sen-

iors will be paying up to 28% more than non-seniors!

What does the 1988 Act do for all this money? Maybe not enough. First, it limits out-of-pocket spending for Medicare services to \$600 for hospital expenses and \$1,370 for physician and out-patient services in 1990. In 1991, the Act covers out-patient prescription drug expenses, available to all Medicare eligible beneficiaries, with a \$600 annual deductible. And, beginning in 1993, the law offers limited coverage for nursing home care, home health care services, and respite care service.

It is inherently clear that the 1988 Act is the wrong solution to catastrophic and long-term care coverage. This is why I voted against the Act last June. My vote was not against providing needed long-term care and catastrophic illness coverage; it was against this particularly costly and inadequate bill. I am now working for passage of my recently introduced reform of this "catastrophic" Act.

RHODES MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

On April 18, 1989, I introduced the Medicare Catastrophic coverage Reform Act of 1989 along with 30 co-sponsors. There have been a few bills introduced that either delay or repeal the current law, which I have co-sponsored, but to date, none of the legislation offers senior Americans needed catastrophic and long-term protection at a reasonable cost. My reform bill is the answer.

The Catastrophic Coverage Reform Act of 1989 is a revised version of the Republican alternative introduced last year as a substitute to the bill that became law. It ensures your right of choice, in that it is a voluntary program. Most important, it retains almost all the vital provisions in the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 at a much lower cost.

The key feature of this legislation revises the manner in which catastrophic protection is financed. This bill eliminates the mandatory "surtax" on America's senior citizens. It returns to the traditional financing method, relating cost paid to benefits received, through the optional Medicare Part B premiums. It also raises the out-of-pocket expenses ceiling from \$1,370 to \$2,230 per year.

Unlike the current law, the Reform Act directly addresses long-term care by stimulating private sector development of long-term care insurance through tax incentives. My legislation allows for the tax-free roll over of funds from a life insurance policy and/or from an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) for the purchase of long-term care insurance. Additionally, it allows employers the same tax deductions for long-term care insurance as are currently used for health and life insurance benefits.

My bill also provides a prescription drug benefit for those elderly who truly need it. Currently, it is estimated that only 17 percent of senior Americans are expected to incur prescription drug expenses in excess of the \$600 deductible dictated in the law passed last year. The Reform Act targets the prescription drug benefit to those most in need: Americans 65 or older who live at below 150 percent of the poverty rate. Additionally, this select group in need will only pay a \$50 annual deductible.

In short, my legislation provides more needed services for the elderly at about half the cost of the current law. Since it is financed through optional Medicare Part B premiums, senior Americans who currently enjoy adequate protection are not forced

into a program they do not need. And Americans who need this protection have the opportunity for coverage at a reasonable cost.

I feel this Reform Act is the fair and equitable answer to the needs of millions of senior Americans. Moreover, it is the right thing to do.

LAST CHANCE TO BE AN ORIGINAL COSPONSOR OF THE MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: All of us have now heard from many of our constituents whom the "Medicare Catastrophic Coverages Act of 1988", P.L. 100-300, was designed to benefit. The majority of senior citizens believe that the benefits unrelated to catastrophic illness, are unnecessary and are paid for by an inequitable tax levied upon the elderly, the so-called supplemental premium (surtax).

On Tuesday, April 18, we will introduce legislation, the "Medicare Catastrophic Reform Act of 1989" to remedy many of the legitimate concerns that have been raised about P.L. 100-300. This bill is very similar to the Republican substitute that won 190 votes when the catastrophic bill was considered on the House floor. It repeals the surtax as well as a number of the non-catastrophic benefits, such as respite care and mammography screening.

The "Medicare Catastrophic Reform Act of 1989" provides benefits addressing the true catastrophic health care needs of the elderly. It is not designed to fund the routine costs of medical care. Under our bill, the new set of catastrophic Medicare will be financed by a modest increase in the existing Part B premium which will be indexed annually to fully fund the costs of the benefits. For example, under current law beneficiaries will be required to pay \$33.90 a month next year for the Part B premium as well the income related surtax. Under our proposals, beneficiaries will have to pay an additional \$6.90 for the Part B premium but they will not be liable for the supplemental premium.

The main features of our bill:

Repeals the income related supplemental premium (surtax);

Retains those provisions of current law that expand the scope of Part A Medicare benefits because these are all legitimate catastrophic expenses, including: removing the limit on days of inpatient hospital services and on hospice care; expanding coverage of skilled nursing facilities; and improving home health care coverage;

Changes the cap on beneficiary expenses to \$2230 for FY 1990;

Repeals coverage for mammography screening, respite care, and home administered intravenous drugs;

Repeals the costly prescription drug benefit and replaces it with a drug benefit under the Medicaid Program for persons over 65 who are at or below 150% of the Federal poverty level. This benefit will be administered through state Medicaid agencies and includes a \$50 deductible.

Retains those provisions in current law that provide protection of income for individuals whose spouse are receiving nursing home care.

We also begin, in this package, to address the overwhelming concerns of the elderly, long-term care. The second title of this bill makes the tax code revisions necessary for the development of the long-term care insurance market.

Adoption of the "Medicare Catastrophic Reform Act of 1989" will result in a package

of benefits designed to meet the true catastrophic health care needs of the elderly. It accomplishes this goal without unfairly taxing those elderly who have been fortunate enough to be able to maintain some savings. We strongly urge you to join us as an original cosponsor of this legislation. To co-sponsor, contact Tracy King at 5-2635 or Pattle DeLoatche at 5-5755.

JOHN J. RHODES III,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
EDWARD R. MADIGAN,
Members of Congress.

RHODES-BILIRAKIS-MADIGAN MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

SPONSORS

Rep. John J. Rhodes III.
Rep. Michael Bilirakis.
Rep. Edward R. Madigan.

ORIGINAL COSPONSORS

Rep. Doug Bereuter.
Rep. Steve Bartlett.
Rep. Richard H. Baker.
Rep. Harris W. Fawell.
Rep. James V. Hansen.
Rep. J. Dennis Hastert.
Rep. Clyde C. Holloway.
Rep. Bob McEwen.
Rep. Dana Rohrabacher.
Rep. Dan Schaefer.
Rep. Norman F. Lent.
Rep. Robert J. Lagomarsino.
Rep. Howard C. Nielson.
Rep. Larry Combest.
Rep. Jim Kolbe.
Rep. Henry J. Hyde.
Rep. Bill Grant.
Rep. Lamar Smith.
Rep. Bob Stump.
Rep. Sonny Callahan.
Rep. Bill McCollum.
Rep. Craig T. James.
Rep. J. Alex McMillan.
Rep. Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.
Rep. Carlos J. Moorhead.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE RHODES-BILIRAKIS-MADIGAN MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

Eliminates income tax surcharge and replaces it with traditional Medicare Part B financing.

Provides tax incentives for the development of the long-term care insurance market.

Retains current protection for individuals whose spouses are receiving nursing home care.

Retains vital Medicare Part A catastrophic coverage provisions in the current law.

Repeals costly drug benefit; institutes a \$50 deductible Medicaid Program drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries over 65 who are living below 150% of the Federal poverty level.

Changes the cap on beneficiary expenses to \$2230 for FY 1990.

Repeals coverage for mammography screening, respite care, and home administered intravenous drugs.

WHAT AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS ARE SAYING . . .

"As I look through this act I see I must pay for something that I will never use. I like many others have insurance that will take care of us if need be. . . . Now why must I pay for another insurance that I will never use?"—D.R., a resident of Phoenix, Arizona.

"What we really need is some kind of coverage for LONG TERM CARE. . . . Actually, most of us didn't need the bill. We had

our own insurance and were doing o.k. It isn't right to lay an age-targeted surtax on people who have worked hard all their lives and saved toward their retirement years. Now, everything we have saved will be double taxed."—G.W., a resident of Phoenix, Arizona.

"It looks to me that what passed as catastrophic coverage has totally missed the mark. It should be called catastrophic legislation."—a resident of New Port Richey, Florida.

"This is my first letter to my congressman in my lifetime. I am 64—my husband 72—senior citizens and we are outraged at the new catastrophic health bill and the unfair tax that has been tacked on to us. . . . We are middle income seniors. We are not on the poverty level nor do we live high on the hog. This 'seniors only' tax is absolutely unacceptable and the long-term health bill leaves much to be desired. Surely our Congress can come up with something better than this mess."—L.T., a resident of Seneca, Illinois.

"My wife and I are Medicare eligible. We already have hospital and medical insurance that covers anything and everything that this catastrophic insurance has to offer. Therefore, we need it like we need two sets of wheels for our Plymouth auto. . . . About the surtax funding, for the U.S. government to force a relatively small number of citizens, segregated by age, not necessarily overly laden with worldly goods, or money, to pay for a large unlimited number of citizens who cannot or will not maintain themselves, is a gross injustice. . . . —C.R., a resident of Clinton, Illinois.

"My wife and I worked for many years and saved part of our income which we invested for our retirement years . . . we expect to buy and pay for our insurance . . . you are taking my savings without my permission."—K.M., a resident of Lincoln, Nebraska.

"The Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act may bring peace of mind to those who pay no tax. But for those of us who live on the lower end of the fixed middle income bracket, the effect is altogether different."—J.S., a resident of Lincoln, Nebraska.

"Call it 'Senior Confiscation Tax Health Insurance.'"—a resident of Illinois.

"Confronting long-term custodial nursing home care should be made a priority"—a resident of Illinois.

SUMMARY OF MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

Provisions retained, without change, from Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 (MCCA).

1. Expanded scope of Medicare Part A benefits, including:

a. Removing day limit on inpatient hospital services.

b. Expanding skilled nursing facility services to 150 days each calendar year.

c. Removing limit on days of hospice care.

d. Limiting inpatient hospital deductible to 1 each year.

e. Restricting coinsurance for skilled nursing facility care to 20% of national average daily rate (for 1989 the figure is \$22.50) for each of the first 8 days in each year.

f. Placing the part A buy-in premium (for those not otherwise eligible for Medicare) on an actuarial basis.

2. Expanding number of consecutive days of home health services to 38 days.

3. Expanded medicaid benefits including:

a. Expanded coverage of pregnant women and infants with income below the poverty line.

b. Protection of income and resources of couple for maintenance of community spouse—prevention of "spousal impoverishment".

4. Miscellaneous provisions, including:

a. Improvements in medigap certification program.

b. U.S. Bipartisan Commission on Comprehensive Health Care.

c. Maintenance of employer efforts, various demonstration projects and studies, and Advisory Committee on Medicare Home Health Claims.

Provisions deleted from MCCA:

1. "Supplemental Medicare Premium" (tax surcharge).

2. Coverage of prescription drugs and insulin.

3. Coverage of home intravenous drug therapy services.

4. Coverage of screening mammography.

5. In-home care for chronically dependent individuals. (Respite care)

Provisions retained, but modified from MCCA:

1. Limit on Medicare Part B cost-sharing changed to \$2,230 per year, rather than \$1,370.

2. Recalculation of additional Part B premium to cover costs of modified catastrophic benefits.

3. Freezing the Medicaid buy-in provision at 85 percent of the federal poverty level instead of going with the 100% phase in proposal.

Additional provisions:

1. Requiring Medicaid coverage of individuals 65 years of age or older with incomes below 150 percent of poverty level with a \$50 deductible. (Substitute drug benefit).

2. Changes in the tax law to promote provision of long-term care insurance.

PRELIMINARY COSTS ESTIMATES FOR JJR'S MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

According to Don Muse of CBO the overall costs of the catastrophic bill for fiscal year 1990 will be between \$3 to 3.5 billion.

According to Don, this figure is high due to the "front-end loading" of the original catastrophic bill. At this point, it is actually reducing the deficit with its financing.

They are still working on the premium estimates. He told me that the language was somewhat tricky. Therefore, it was taking some time.

He was able to give me the cost estimates for the reformed drug benefit and all of Title II.

Drug Benefit Costs: 1990—\$200 million, 1991—\$377 million, 1992—\$470 million, 1993—\$560 million, and 1994—\$620 million.

1. Number of elderly who will benefit from drug provision: 1990—1,850; 1991—2,265; 1992—2,590; 1993—2,830; 1994—2,880.

Percentage of Medicare eligible: 1990—5.6 percent; 1991—6.8 percent; 1992—7.6 percent; 1993—8.2 percent; 1994—8.2 percent.

The way current law is drafted the deductible determines the amount of beneficiaries. Thus, the law dictates that 16.8 percent of medicare eligible benefit from the drug provision. CBO determined the deductible to be \$600 to meet the requirement.

In CBO's re-estimate the numbers of beneficiaries have actually dropped.

New estimate of those receiving drug benefit under current law: 1990—16.6 percent; 1991—16.4 percent; 1992—16.8 percent; 1993—16.8 percent.

TABLE 4.—PREMIUMS PAID BY MEDICARE ENROLLEES, CALENDAR YEARS

[In dollars per month per enrollee]

	Calendar years					
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
MONTHLY FLAT PREMIUMS						
New premiums—						
Proposed Law:						
Catastrophic	4.00	9.70	10.80	11.90	13.10	14.50
Drug	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total new catastrophic premiums	4.00	9.70	10.80	11.90	13.10	14.50
SMI basic premium ¹	27.90	31.10	34.50	36.10	37.80	39.40
Total flat premium	31.90	40.80	45.30	48.00	50.90	53.90
CBO Baseline—Current Law:						
Catastrophic	4.00	4.90	5.46	6.75	7.18	8.00
Drug	0	0	1.94	2.45	3.02	3.00
Total catastrophic premiums	4.00	4.90	7.40	9.20	10.20	11.00
SMI basic premium	27.90	29.00	30.40	31.90	33.40	34.80
Total flat premium	31.90	33.90	37.80	41.10	43.60	45.80
Difference:						
Catastrophic	0	4.80	5.34	5.15	5.92	6.50
Drug	0	0	-1.94	-2.45	-3.02	-3.00
Total catastrophic premiums	0	4.80	3.40	2.70	2.90	3.50
SMI basic premium	0	2.10	4.10	4.20	4.40	4.60
Total difference	0	6.90	7.50	6.90	7.30	8.10

¹ The SMI basic premium reflects the proposal to set the SMI basic premium to cover 25 percent of basic SMI costs.

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
New premiums—Proposed law (not deficit neutral):						
Catastrophic	4.00	9.70	10.80	11.90	13.10	14.50
SMI basic premium	27.90	31.10	34.50	36.10	37.80	39.40
Total flat premium	31.90	40.80	45.30	48.00	50.90	53.90
New premiums—Proposed law (deficit neutral):						
Catastrophic	4.00	9.70	10.80	11.90	13.10	14.50
Additional premium	0	11.70	1.30	3.10	1.40	.50
SMI basic premium	27.90	31.10	34.50	36.10	37.80	39.40
Total flat premium	31.90	52.50	46.60	51.10	52.30	54.40
Current law:						
Catastrophic	4.00	4.90	5.46	6.75	7.18	8.00
Drug	0	0	1.94	2.45	3.02	3.00
Total catastrophic premium	4.00	4.90	7.40	9.20	10.20	11.00
SMI basic premium	27.90	29.00	30.40	31.90	33.40	34.80
Total flat premium	31.90	33.90	37.80	41.10	43.60	45.80

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for bringing this motion to the floor.

This motion involves a conference and hearings, but let us not make any mistake about it. What we are trying to do with this motion is to repeal the catastrophic illness surtax on senior citizens. That is the point of this motion, to get that process started.

I have heard from seniors in my district at many town meetings and many forums; they do not like this tax, which will cost them hundreds of dol-

lars a year and in some cases up to a thousand dollars a year.

They do not like it for two reasons: No. 1, it is a group tax, a tax on one group, senior citizens. The second reason they do not like it is because the proceeds are going to catastrophic illness insurance and not to meet the nursing care needs most seniors need more acutely.

Mr. Speaker, let us get on with this. Let us fix the catastrophic insurance bill and repeal the surtax.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from some of the correspondence that I have received from my constituents in Florida.

It looks to me that what passed as catastrophic coverage has totally missed the mark. It should be called catastrophic legislation.

That is from a resident of New Port Richey, FL.

Here is what another resident of New Port Richey, FL said:

We have scrimped and saved all our lives to save money to live comfortably in our old age. Because we have interests on those savings, we are taxed on that interest. Now, through the new surtax, we will pay unfairly for not being a burden on our community or our country.

This is from a resident of Palm Harbor, FL:

I feel the catastrophic income tax is extremely unfair to the senior citizens of this country, especially those trying to get by on income from social security. Therefore, I am asking for your help in changing this legislation.

The last quote I have is from a resident of Holiday, FL:

Not one single retired person or anyone over 65 whom I have talked with has yet accepted this program. We violently object to this method of financing.

Mr. Speaker, we must listen to those whom we represent. After all, the Founders intended that this be a republic, which means that we represent those people and we should be their voices in Washington. They are telling us to listen to them. We listened in 1983 when, after a lot of hardheadedness and stubbornness in this body, we finally got around to rescinding the income tax on the withholding of income tax on interest and dividends, as we may recall, and that was after we finally decided to listen to our constituents.

□ 1300

I said so earlier this year when the people who hired us said that you do not deserve a pay raise, at least not the way it was being conducted, and finally when it looked to be a virtual certainty we finally listened to them, and I say to my colleagues that we must listen to them again. They are telling us that what they did, although well-intentioned, was bad, that

it was wrong, so they are saying to take another look at it, open it up.

I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about catastrophic, let us take a look at the drug provision in the current bill. It is catastrophic in the sense that it does not help the poor. It has a \$600 deductible attached to it.

It has been proven that less than 10 percent of the people out there actually spend as much as \$600 on prescription drugs. Therefore, who are we really helping when it comes to this piece of legislation? The new pieces of legislation which are being considered would lower that deductible to \$50, if you will, and apply itself only to those over 65 and those who are up to 150 percent of the poverty level, the people we really should be intending to help here.

So basically I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to our colleagues, let us open up our minds. Let us be broad-minded. We have a group of people out there who are telling us, "Look, you made a mistake." Let us admit it and at least open it up and take another look at it, particularly the financing provisions.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I could extrapolate on a famous Churchillian quote:

Never have so many given so much for so little.

It is very clear that we must repeal this tax. Why? Because it hurts most those it is intended to benefit, and it is a tax upon a tax.

When we look at the prescription trust fund, if you go all the way up to 1993, the shortfall has been estimated by HCFA at \$4.5 billion. It is \$500 million in 1991, \$2.5 billion in 1992, and \$4.5 billion by 1993.

With all these things in mind, we clearly want to repeal the tax, but that is not what Mr. DANNEMEYER is calling for. He is simply asking that we support the concept of hearings, and while we are here in this Capitol under great attack from the media and others, how can we possibly oppose more hearings, more democracy, a greater opportunity to address this issue?

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for offering instructions to the conferees to hold hearings on the catastrophic bill. The catastrophic bill is in need of surgery and that surgery can be applied

after the hearings that should be held by this deliberative body.

You know, when the bill passed, and it has a lot of good components in it, people did not realize the real impact of it. It was only after it went into effect that they did, and indeed once they did, we realized the deleterious effects of our senior citizens whose quality of life and health care we want to preserve.

Indeed, retirees on fixed incomes are finding that they cannot even afford it. Retirees on fixed incomes are finding that even if they are eligible, but they do not receive benefits, they must pay. Federal retirees, of whom I represent about 26,000, are finding that despite amendments that were placed on the bill, it is duplicating what they already have in abundance.

Indeed, my office is probably no exception, I have heard from more people on that issue, who realize the impact of the catastrophic bill, than I did even on the pay raise issue.

It is time for us to hold hearings and it would be appropriate for us to review the funding mechanism so that we can make changes and so that we can prepare for the real need, which is long term care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to support the language for H.R. 2.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct House conferees to insist on the Senate provision of H.R. 2 calling for a reexamination of the funding mechanism for the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988.

I have heard from thousands of retired Federal employees, retired military employees, and retired private sector employees who are concerned about the inequities in the new law. Many of these retired Americans have related their concerns that they are paying for expanded Medicare coverage which duplicates coverage they have from private sources at a much lower cost.

I believe that the 101st Congress must reevaluate the funding mechanism of the new law that will subject retirees, regardless of whether they are already covered under Federal, military, or other employer-provided health insurance plans, to a supplemental premium based on Federal income tax liability.

Throughout the consideration of the new law, I worked to alert my congressional colleagues to the effect that the proposed expansion of the Medicare system would have on those retired Americans who were already protected from catastrophic expenses. I also have consistently believed that the most significant catastrophic expense faced by the elderly relates to long-term health care costs—which were

not addressed in the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Protection Act.

I have been in close contact with representatives of retiree groups, including the National Association of Retired Federal Employees [NARFE] and the Retired Officers Association [TROA] to determine strategies for most effectively changing the new law. The first step, however, must be for the Congress to convene hearings and to listen to the elderly of this Nation who are directly affected by and who are paying for this new Medicare Program.

There is a growing and united front of retired Americans known as the Coalition for Affordable Health Care who are concerned about the new law and are represented by the following groups:

National Association of Retired Federal Employees.

The Retired Officers Association.

American Foreign Service Association.

Mail Handlers.

National Association of Postal Supervisors.

National Association of Letter Carriers.

National Association of Postmasters.

National Association of Postal Supervisors.

International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers.

American Foundation for the Blind.

Florida Seniors for Medicare Equity.

Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.

E.X.P.O.S.E.

Rural Letter Carriers Association.

U.S. Army Warrant Officers Association.

National Association for Uniformed Services.

Air Force Association.

Non Commissioned Officers Association.

National League of Postmasters.

National Treasury Employees Union.

Marine Corps League.

Naval Reserve Association.

Council of Sacramento Senior Organizations.

Association of Military Surgeons of the United States.

International Association of Fire Fighters.

California State Employees Association.

United Seniors of America/San Diego.

National Association for Public Health Policy.

Air Force Sergeants Association.

Reserve Officers Association.

The Retired Enlisted Association.

U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association.

Seniors Opposing the Surtax/Trenton, NJ.

Heritage Harbour Homeowners Association Committee on Catastrophic Coverage/Annapolis, MD.

National Alliance of Senior Citizens. Pennsylvania Association of School Retirees.

We owe it to every older American to provide fair and equitable health care and it's time we address the growing concern of thousands upon thousands of the Nation's senior citizens that the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 is in need of revision.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I commend the gentleman from California for bringing this bill up at this time and join wholeheartedly with him.

I do not believe that my office has received any mail in the quantities that we have received in opposition to the catastrophic health bill. The seniors feel that they have been had. The seniors who for many, many years, as they were working and were setting aside money so they would be taken care of when they retired, find now that that money is being taken from them through the catastrophic health bill. They provided for themselves. They do not need this coverage. This is not what they wanted and they are saying, "Do something about it, U.S. Congress."

So Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in support of the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would just like to have a colloquy, if I could, with the gentleman. It was suggested a little earlier that we are dealing here with simply a procedural issue.

Let me ask the gentleman, is it his feeling, as it is mine, that we are dealing here primarily with the first step toward repeal of what we regard as a bad program?

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct. This Member would like to have put that expressly in the motion to instruct, but the rules of germaneness prohibit us from doing so. So we are using this vehicle or asking that we accede to the Senate version which asks for hearings on the subject.

Mr. WALKER. But in bringing the issue to the floor, it is my understanding that what the gentleman is really intending to do is to get us hearings where hopefully we can outline how bad this program is, how outrageous the tax really is, so that we can take that step toward actual repeal of the

program, particularly getting rid of the tax. That is the direction the gentleman wants to move, if I understand correctly.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I hope that the Ways and Means Committee in our House will hold hearings on it, that the Committee on Energy and Commerce which has partial jurisdiction and the Republican Study Committee, by the way, is holding a hearing this Thursday at 9 o'clock on this subject, and I think there are other committees of our body that might also want to hold hearings to determine the impact on the senior citizens of this country.

Mr. WALKER. So no one voting on this motion should kid themselves. It is the intent of the people bringing the motion to the floor to have this be the first step in repeal of the catastrophic health bill of last year and that those who vote yes on the motion to instruct are really voting for taking that first step toward repealing the program; is that correct?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has properly spoken and I thank him for making this contribution.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at long last we have an opportunity to take positive action to begin reexamining the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act.

Every Member of this House has heard from retirees who are upset about the financing of this act and want it changed. The refusal of the relevant committees in both Houses of Congress to hold hearings on this issue has been a source of frustration for those of us who want to review the Catastrophic Coverage Act. Today we have an opportunity to get the ball rolling by expressing our wish that the Senate Finance Committee hold hearings.

This act must be reformed to ensure the fairness of its financing. By voting in favor of this motion to instruct, we put ourselves on record in support of taking another look at the Catastrophic Coverage Act in the Senate and, by inference, in the House. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, "Read my lips, make my day." Who signed this new tax into law? Is that a proper parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the preferential motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—408

Ackerman	Crockett	Hall (TX)
Akaka	Dannemeyer	Hamilton
Alexander	Darden	Hammerschmidt
Anderson	Davis	Hancock
Andrews	de la Garza	Hastert
Annunzio	DeFazio	Hatcher
Anthony	DeLay	Hawkins
Applegate	Dellums	Hayes (IL)
Archer	Derrick	Hayes (LA)
Armey	DeWine	Hefley
Aspin	Dickinson	Hefner
Atkins	Dicks	Henry
AuCoin	Dingell	Henger
Baker	Dixon	Hertel
Ballenger	Donnelly	Hiler
Barnard	Dorgan (ND)	Hochbrueckner
Bartlett	Dorman (CA)	Holloway
Barton	Douglas	Hopkins
Bateman	Downey	Houghton
Bates	Dreier	Hoyer
Beilenson	Duncan	Hubbard
Bennett	Durbin	Huckaby
Bentley	Dwyer	Hughes
Bereuter	Dyson	Hutto
Berman	Early	Hyde
Bevill	Eckart	Inhofe
Bilbray	Edwards (CA)	Ireland
Bilirakis	Edwards (OK)	Jacobs
Bliley	Emerson	Jenkins
Boehlert	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boggs	English	Johnson (SD)
Bonior	Erdreich	Johnston
Borski	Espy	Jones (GA)
Bosco	Evans	Jones (NC)
Boxer	Fascell	Jontz
Brennan	Fawell	Kanjorski
Brooks	Fazio	Kaptur
Broomfield	Feighan	Kasich
Browder	Fields	Kastenmeier
Brown (CA)	Fish	Kennedy
Brown (CO)	Flake	Kennelly
Bruce	Flippo	Kildee
Bryant	Florio	Klecza
Buechner	Foglietta	Kolbe
Bunning	Foley	Kostmayer
Burton	Ford (MI)	Kyl
Bustamante	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Byron	Frank	Lagomarsino
Callahan	Frenzel	Lantos
Campbell (CA)	Frost	Leach (IA)
Campbell (CO)	Galleghy	Leath (TX)
Cardin	Gallo	Lehman (FL)
Carper	Garcia	Leland
Carr	Gaydos	Lent
Chapman	Gejdenson	Levin (MI)
Clarke	Gekas	Levine (CA)
Clay	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Clement	Gillmor	Lewis (FL)
Clinger	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Gingrich	Lightfoot
Coelho	Glickman	Lipinski
Coleman (MO)	Gonzalez	Livingston
Coleman (TX)	Goodling	Lloyd
Collins	Gordon	Long
Combest	Goss	Luken, Thomas
Conte	Gradison	Lukens, Donald
Conyers	Grandy	Machtley
Costello	Grant	Madigan
Coughlin	Gray	Manton
Courter	Green	Markey
Cox	Guarini	Marlenee
Craig	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Crane	Hall (OH)	Martin (NY)

Martinez	Petri	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Pickett	Smith (VT)
Mavroules	Pickle	Smith, Denny
Mazzei	Porter	(OR)
McCloskey	Poshard	Smith, Robert
McCormack	Price	(NH)
McCrery	Pursell	Smith, Robert
McCurdy	Quillen	(OR)
McDade	Rahall	Snowe
McDermott	Rangel	Solarz
McEwen	Ravenel	Solomon
McGrath	Ray	Spence
McHugh	Regula	Spratt
McMillan (NC)	Rhodes	Stallings
McMillen (MD)	Richardson	Stangeland
McNulty	Ridge	Stark
Meyers	Rinaldo	Stearns
Mfume	Ritter	Stenholm
Michel	Roberts	Stokes
Miller (CA)	Robinson	Studds
Miller (OH)	Roe	Stump
Miller (WA)	Rogers	Sundquist
Mineta	Rohrabacher	Swift
Moakley	Rose	Synar
Molinari	Rostenkowski	Tallon
Mollohan	Roth	Tanner
Montgomery	Roukema	Tauke
Moody	Rowland (CT)	Tauzin
Moorhead	Rowland (GA)	Thomas (CA)
Morella	Roybal	Thomas (GA)
Morrison (CT)	Russo	Torres
Morrison (WA)	Sabo	Torricelli
Mrazek	Saiki	Towns
Murphy	Sangmeister	Trafficant
Murtha	Sarpaluis	Traxler
Myers	Savage	Udall
Nagle	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Natcher	Saxton	Upton
Neal (MA)	Schaefer	Valentine
Neal (NC)	Scheuer	Vander Jagt
Nelson	Schiff	Vento
Nielson	Schroeder	Visclosky
Nowak	Schuetter	Volkmmer
Oakar	Schulze	Vucanovich
Oberstar	Schumer	Walgren
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Olin	Sharp	Walsh
Ortiz	Shaw	Watkins
Owens (NY)	Shays	Waxman
Owens (UT)	Shumway	Weber
Oxley	Shuster	Weiss
Packard	Sikorski	Wheat
Pallone	Sisisky	Whitten
Panetta	Skaggs	Williams
Parker	Skeen	Wilson
Parris	Skelton	Wise
Pashayan	Slaterry	Wolf
Patterson	Slaughter (NY)	Wolpe
Paxon	Slaughter (VA)	Wyden
Payne (VA)	Smith (FL)	Wyllie
Pease	Smith (IA)	Yates
Pelosi	Smith (MS)	Yatron
Penny	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Perkins	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Boucher	Horton	McCandless
Chandler	Hunter	Payne (NJ)
Cooper	James	Pepper
Coyne	Kolter	Schneider
Dymally	Lancaster	Staggers
Gephardt	Laughlin	Weldon
Hansen	Lehman (CA)	Whittaker
Harris	Lowery (CA)	
Hoagland	Lowery (NY)	

□ 1327

Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. FASCELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the preferential motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment (except section 115 and title II), and modifications committed to conference: Messrs.

HAWKINS, MURPHY, FORD of Michigan, CLAY, WILLIAMS, HAYES of Illinois, PERKINS, PAYNE of New Jersey, GOODLING, PETRI, BARTLETT, ARMEY, and FAWELL.

For consideration of section 115 and title II of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: MESSRS. ROSTENKOWSKI, JACOBS, and ARCHER.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today during rollcall vote No. 31. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 31 on the Danne-meyer motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2 to accept the Senate language calling for a hearing on the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act, I was unavoidably detained.

If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, on House rollcall vote No. 31, Mr. DANNEMEYER's resolution to instruct the minimum wage conferees to support the Senate amendment requiring hearings on the Catastrophic Health Care Act, let the record show I would have voted "aye" on the measure.

I spoke in favor of the resolution, but was detained away from the floor and was unable to get back in time to cast my vote.

In fact, I did vote orally, however, before the rollcall vote for the motion to instruct conferees.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1989, TO TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1989, AND CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1989, THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1989, FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1989, OR SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1989, TO MONDAY, MAY 1, 1989

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 97

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Tuesday, April 18, 1989, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, April 25, 1989, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when

the Senate recesses or adjourns on Wednesday, April 19, 1989, or Thursday, April 20, 1989, or Friday, April 21, 1989, or Saturday, April 22, 1989, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, it stand in recess or stand adjourned until 1 o'clock post meridian on Monday, May 1, 1989, or on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1330

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to inquire if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is going to have any time to explain to the House precisely what this means in terms of some Members' concerns about the schedule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is required by the constitutional provision that neither house shall adjourn for more than 3 days without the permission of the other.

We are planning to adjourn from tonight until Tuesday at noon in recognition of the Passover holiday. This had been planned for some time. It is unusual, however, for us to adjourn in the circumstance which requires the consent of the Senate. And the Senate will be, if the House agrees, sent this resolution.

That is all it does; it just permits the technical adjournment of the House until next Tuesday.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might then inquire of the distinguished majority leader so that all of our colleagues and their staffs can be very clear, there will be no votes on Monday; Members, as long as they are back by noon on Tuesday, are protected. I just wanted to clarify that because we had several questions about that.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes.

We will probably have an amendment of the schedule this afternoon. But for this purpose the gentleman is correct; if this resolution is agreed to by both Houses, Members can be assured there will be no session or meet-

ing of the House of Representatives until noon of Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LET US ACT IMMEDIATELY ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR OUR VETERANS AND NOT CHRISTMAS-TREE IT WITH UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, Ann Landers in her column yesterday pointed out that families of patients of the Veterans' Administration are bringing soap and other incidentals, due to the severe shortage of supplies, to Veterans' hospitals across our Nation.

Some weeks ago the new Secretary of the Veterans Affairs requested of the Congress an additional \$300 million to meet the immediate shortfall for care of our veterans in the Veterans' hospital system. It has now come to the attention of many Members of Congress that perhaps this supplemental appropriation requested by the President, the Secretary and desired by so many of us is attempting to be added to, to be piggybacked by a whole series of requests that as of yesterday now totals in excess of \$2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the President has said that he will not support such a supplemental appropriation. In the process the veterans of America will once again be injured.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the leadership to act immediately upon the supplemental appropriation for our veterans and to not Christmas-tree the package with unnecessary expenditures.

CUT UP YOUR EXXON CARDS AND MAIL THEM TO EXXON

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the 1¼ million gallons of oil that spewed from the Exxon Valdez caused a horrifying amount of environmental damage.

Exxon's irresponsible behavior before the accident as well as Exxon's tepid and glacial response after the catastrophe have likewise shocked the Nation.

Exxon's environmental record over the years—the Everglades, the Hudson River, and now, Prince William

Sound—is among the worst in the oil industry.

I am voting to give vent to my outrage by cutting up my Exxon card and sending it to Exxon.

And I am not going to buy Exxon products until Exxon shows it means business about paying for the awful damage it has done.

Why don't we all empower ourselves as gasoline customers?

Why don't we all cast our votes of total disgust with Exxon's gross irresponsibility?

Cut up your Exxon cards.

Mail them to Exxon.

Exxon must clean up the mess it created.

The Coast Guard says the job must be done by September 15 because of winter weather.

So let us not buy Exxon products, until Exxon shows that it will clean up the mess by September 15, until it commits legally to paying for cleaning up the entire oilspill, to paying for all the damage Exxon did to the \$100 million Alaskan fishing industry, and to paying to restore the devastated wildlife.

We will never know how many of our credit cards are returned to Exxon. But our vote of collective outrage made in the marketplace will be a signal that Exxon will understand, and it will be the shot that is heard around the world.

CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE REFORM ACT OF 1989

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressmen RHODES, MADIGAN, and myself are introducing the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Reform Act of 1989—an issue of paramount importance to older Americans throughout Florida and the United States. As a Member of Congress representing one of the highest percentages of seniors in the country, I have received thousands and thousands of communications from irate constituents who are outraged by provisions in the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act.

Our bill would repeal the catastrophic surtax, provide incentives for development of long-term care policies, guard against spousal impoverishment, and pursue a more reasonable and affordable solution to this serious issue.

The endorsement we have received from our colleagues on this bill is wonderful, and I am hopeful that we will continue to receive support from both Republicans and Democrats in this endeavor.

I believe that our bill is a rational and reasonable alternative to the cur-

rent law which seniors do not want, and in many cases, may not need. It is time for Congress to heed the cry of our seniors and take action. I believe that the Rhodes-Bilirakis-Madigan bill is a step in the right direction.

NATIONAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. ANDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of urgency that I address you today. As you may know, last week I introduced House Joint Resolution 236, a bill designating April as National Cancer Awareness Month. It was my hope to have the needed 218 cosponsors by yesterday, however, this did not occur.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know the devastating effects brought on by cancer. I doubt there is a person in this Chamber, or in the gallery, that has not been affected by this killer. It has destroyed lives, families, and loved ones. In 1988 alone, an estimated 494,000 Americans died of cancer. It is expected that cancer will strike in three out of four American families this year. I will not continue to cite these shocking statistics, because I think most of us recognize the devastation caused by cancer.

My urgency in trying to pass this resolution did not stem entirely from my own commitment to heightening America's awareness of cancer. Rather, it was the courage and commitment of a gentleman from my district, Mr. William Croker. It was only a short time ago that I learned that he would be arriving here in Washington on Monday to help promote National Cancer Awareness Month, to encourage people to get cancer checkups. This unselfish individual did not fly into Dulles Airport on a wide-body jet. He did not arrive by Amtrak at Union Station. Mr. Croker didn't even attempt to make the long journey by car. No, Mr. Speaker, this individual, known to us in California as "Walkin' Willie," made the 3,000-mile cross-country journey on foot. That is correct. He walked the entire country for over 65 days, arriving here in Washington Sunday night.

Why did "Walkin' Willie" make this, his second cross-country journey? It was not for personal gain. It was not for money. It wasn't even to lose a few extra pounds. Willie, lost his mother, father, and sister to cancer, and made this journey as a special way to tell America to pay attention to this killer disease, and take steps to prevent it.

I walked down to this Chamber to stand before you and make a pitch for a bill I introduced last week. I now ask you to look into the gallery at a man who walked across the country in sup-

port of this bill. Although William Croker resides in my district, his message is global. I applaud this heroic individual and I ask you to give him the appreciation he deserves by cosponsoring this bill, passing it, and sending it to the President.

□ 1350

IN HONOR OF BAYLOR UNIVERSITY'S DR. WIMPEE

(Mr. FIELDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 19, 1989, my alma mater, Baylor University, will honor a man loved by many generations of Baylor students. That man is Dr. W.J. Wimpee.

Dr. Wimpee has dedicated 44 years, more than half of his life, to Baylor University, its students, and the surrounding community.

From 1936 through 1940, Dr. Wimpee was a student, himself, at Baylor. He was an outstanding athlete as well as a campus leader. After graduation from Baylor, Dr. Wimpee earned a master and a doctorate of theology from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

In 1945, Baylor University called Dr. Wimpee back to serve as director of religious activities. Later, Dr. Wimpee became the first chaplain of Baylor. In 1955, he became executive assistant to the president of the university. Among many other accomplishments, Dr. Wimpee has been active in expanding Baylor's International Exchange Program.

But, most of all, Dr. Wimpee is respected, admired and loved by the students and faculty, alike, for his kindness, compassion and concern for each and every person he meets.

My life is better for having known Dr. Wimpee. And, I know many people all around the world who can say the same thing. I can think of no higher commendation for any man than to be held in high esteem by those who have crossed his path.

A DOUBLE STANDARD?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, JIM WRIGHT, is under the microscope today, Ronald Reagan is sunbathing in California.

Now, I do not mean to take off on the former President, the truth is, he did not even pay for the pool. Eighteen wealthy friends bought the President, former President and First Lady, a brand new home, pool, and all. What

is evident to me down here is we have two standards, one that will allow Ronald Reagan to live high on the hog and another one that would force the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, to wallow in the mire.

Now, let us face it. This JIM WRIGHT ordeal is not about rules, it is about politics, pure and simple. Republican and Democrat. Let me remind my Democrat colleagues that we were not sent down here to attend a Rotary convention. Let us get serious. It is time for the Democrats to tell the Republicans to take their hands off our Speaker.

THE 71ST ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. CAMPBELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, the territories of the three Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have had a harsh history, having served as battlefields in several wars. Nevertheless, the love of freedom is still burning brightly in all three countries and has been, indeed, strengthened mightily in the last 2 years. Having for decades smoldered as a suppressed protest, it broke out last summer as an open popular demand for an end of Soviet Russian occupation, or at least a self-rule in the realm of economics and political decision-making—apart from the oppressive central command system in the Kremlin. Huge public meetings of up to 300,000 people repeatedly voiced these ardent aspirations of Estonians to the world.

As Estonians solemnly mark the 71st anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence declared in 1918, our country can take pride in having steadfastly refused recognition of the forcible takeover of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. This honorable position of not according legality to an illegal act of occupation has been a source of hope to the Estonians through the many rough years. I sincerely expect the United States to let this beacon of hope shine even more strongly and clearly in support of democratic freedoms and an eventually regained national independence in Estonia, as first proclaimed 71 years ago and then successfully defended against the onslaughts of both the Soviet and German troops in 1918-20.

And I am proud to associate myself with Mr. Heino Jogis, an American and an Estonian, a lover of freedom, whose eloquent words, with humility, I have just delivered.

A CALL FOR DELAYED TED REGULATIONS

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to correct a serious problem in my congressional district and in many districts along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

The dedicated and hard-working men and women who own and operate shrimp fishing vessels are being threatened by Federal regulations which may cause many of these people to lose their businesses.

According to the 1988 Reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, shrimpers will be required to attach turtle excluder devices [TED's] to their fishing nets beginning on May 1, 1989.

Due to the potential impact of these TED's, the endangered species reauthorization also required a study be completed on sea turtle conservation and sea turtle mortality.

This study is to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, with the findings transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce by April 1, 1989.

This deadline was established to allow the Secretary of Commerce and the Congress consider all existing methods of protecting sea turtles prior to the imposition of TED's regulations.

Unfortunately, the National Academy of Sciences has barely completed the introductory steps required to conduct the study.

The panel has recently been appointed, and is scheduled to hold their initial meeting on May 4, 1989.

This is over a full month past the due date for the study's findings.

The legislation that I am introducing today will delay any TED's regulations for 2 years after the Secretary of Commerce provides the study's findings to appropriate committees of the U.S. Congress.

This delay will provide adequate time and opportunity for the Congress to review all findings of the National Academy of Sciences' study.

In addition, this legislation allows the Secretary of Commerce to suspend all TED's regulations if the study determines that alternative means of protecting the sea turtles are effective.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, which will allow the National Academy of Sciences to investigate sea turtle preservation without burdening a group of hard-working fishermen and women.

□ 1350

SALUTE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the efforts of the unsung heroes of congressional staffs: our interns. From every State and county, they gather and learn here at the world's monument to democracy. The spirit and enthusiasm which guides these young men and women serve as potent reminders of our mission in this Chamber. That mission is the challenge to make each of their futures brighter and more engulfed in optimism than any generation before them.

Indeed there is reason for this optimism, for these are distinguished young men and women. Tomorrow's leaders have come to our offices to help solve today's problems. These volunteers go beyond their pursuits on Capitol Hill—they are scholars, athletes, and community volunteers as well. But most importantly, they are role models, not just for their own generation, but for all of us. Interns choose the difficult path of balancing academics, extracurricular activities and their work here, not just to advance their own dreams, but to advance the American dream.

I have been very fortunate to have had an exceptional team of young people at my side over the past 2 years. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to them and to salute their efforts on and off Capitol Hill. I wish them all the success that they have earned as they pursue their own, uniquely American dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a list of my interns to be placed in the RECORD:

LIST OF CONGRESSMAN BUECHNER'S INTERNS

Paul Sumner.
Michelle Althoff.
Elaine Kaufman.
Kathleen Kelley.
Zoe Lindeman.
Victor Sedaka.
Paul LeBeau.
Steve Lynum.
Lisa Dunford.
Angela Bronner.
Maria Morris.
Kimberly Huefner.
Danielle Conger.
Jeremy Crandell.
Andrew Jacus.
Dan Walsh.
Jennifer Wilson.
Paul Mamalian.
Charles Silverston.
Michael Keller.
Howard Opinsky.
Allyn Matlack.
Cheryl Litzinger.
Stephanie Ortbals.
Frank Purcell.
Jonathan Schwartz.
Lenny Genovese.

Bryan Tramont.

A TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER WRIGHT

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, it was just 2 years ago this month during the Easter break of 1987 that 20 House Members, 11 Democrats and 9 Republicans, took a trip to the Soviet Union. It was a trip led by our House Speaker JIM WRIGHT. It was during the fourth month that JIM WRIGHT had been our House Speaker.

The 19 Members of Congress who were with Speaker WRIGHT on that trip know for certain how effective JIM WRIGHT was as the leader of our delegation. Many of us on that trip, Republicans and Democrats alike, know that the real thaw between Soviet Union and United States relations began about the time Mikhail Gorbachev and JIM WRIGHT had some long conversations during that trip 2 years ago. It was so obvious that Mikhail Gorbachev was very fond of and admired JIM and Betty WRIGHT.

As a congressman from western Kentucky, I would like to make the comment that many Kentuckians are very appreciative of the support of Speaker WRIGHT and have great admiration for House Speaker JIM WRIGHT. We in western Kentucky definitely remember the 3 trips JIM WRIGHT has made to our district to help us with the huge U.S. Department of Energy plant in Paducah, and we remember the support the Speaker gave us for the Tennessee Valley Authority's Land Between the Lakes.

Western Kentuckians know how helpful Speaker JIM WRIGHT has been with legislation concerning Kentucky Lake and Kentucky Dam, Lake Barkley and Barkley Dam, as well as the Nation's largest job corps center at Morganfield, KY and, yes, Fort Campbell, the home of the 101st Airborne Division.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from western Kentucky, I stand here today and say, thank you, JIM WRIGHT, for what you have done for our country and what you have done for the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

A FEELING OF PRIDE FOR THE INSTITUTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks we have all witnessed the attacks which have come from the media on this institution, and I argue that the

scrutiny which we are under is unfortunately a bad reflection not just on the Democratic Party and the Republican Party but on this entire institution and also on the American people. I will say that the most recent article I have seen on this subject is one entitled, "How Congress Really Works," which appears in this week's Newsweek magazine. I am sure some of the Members have had an opportunity to see it. The caption says: "The world of Congress; it's a fortress of unreality with its own laws, logic, and codes of behavior."

Well, that may be true, but I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I still get a tingle down my spine when I walk by and look at the Capitol dome. When I come back from having visited some of the most troubled spots in the world I realize that the world still looks to the United States of America as the last bastion of freedom. I want to say that as a Member elected from California, I for one am very proud to have the privilege to serve in the greatest deliberative body ever known to man.

POLISH ROUNDTABLE NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I come to the House floor in wholehearted support of an action taken by the administration. But today, Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the President's plan for encouraging the positive momentum of change in Poland.

A couple of weeks ago the Polish Government and Solidarity signed important agreements on free elections, power sharing, and pluralism. Remarkable events are occurring in Poland only months ago thought impossible—just yesterday the Polish Government legalized Solidarity.

Government and opposition negotiations are enabling political organizations and trade unions to play a substantive role in Polish society. Upcoming free, and what we trust will be fair, elections in June should pave the way for the institutionalization of reform. It is only right that the United States respond to Poland's request for moral, political, and economic support. I think the administration's plan announced yesterday will demonstrate our commitment to the people of Poland in their quest for democratic reform.

Poland has severe economic problems that warrant the attention of the United States. United States willingness to work with the IMF and the World Bank for loans to Poland will help the Government manage its foreign debt. GSP status and OPIC loans will also assist in Poland's economic

reforms. Encouraging private sector investment in Poland and the possibility of a negotiated agreement to help the Polish private sector will go a long way to improve the economic climate.

I commend the President for demonstrating his commitment to the Polish people. The administration and Congress must work together to ensure that real reform is solidly based and not easily destroyed by changing political winds.

TAKE ME OUT TO THE BALLPARK

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, baseball is America's pastime. Every spring the ritual begins.

In Baltimore we are proud to have the Orioles who have been the host of eight American League playoffs and six World Series. Last season the Birds finished poorly, but we knew they would be back, and in the third week of the new season the Orioles are actively battling to get into first place.

In Congress we do not have the luxury of waiting until next year. Our budget problems abound. But we can learn from the spirit of the fans who never quit believing in their team. We must believe that Americans can build better products; we must believe that Americans can and will compete, if Congress would let them. We must believe that America will have and be a first place team. We will if we place faith in our team, the American worker.

DISAPPROVING RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAUZIN). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, April 11, 1989, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) disapproving the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

□ 1359

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) with Mr. BRUCE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednes-

day, April 12, 1989, 8 hours of general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, April 11, 1989, 2 hours of general debate remain.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

□ 1400

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half of my time, one-half hour, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to know how much time I am allotted in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has been allotted 1 hour.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to vote today on a recommendation that we disapprove the work of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Mr. Chairman, we are not ready to vote on that subject today, at least not ready to vote intelligently upon it. We have never had an independent analysis of the work that the Commission has done, and indeed there is a great deal of information about that indicates, in fact, that the savings that are projected by the Commission at \$693 million a year will not be anywhere near that sum.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Commission, as did 85 percent of the House and the Senate Members. I did so because I think we all realize that our Nation's security cannot depend upon politics, but rather upon sound judgments about what our Nation needs for defense purposes and neither can we fail to expend the taxpayers' money other than efficiently and wisely in the pursuit of those purposes.

Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Commission I obviously knew that Fort Sheridan in my 10th District of Illinois was at risk. It has been on past closure lists for at least 20 years. Some in the media had depicted it as a base that has nothing but a golf course and a beach, and nothing could be further from the truth, or less intelligent, or

understanding, or researched. But I supported it with the understanding that the Commission would approach its job honestly and fairly and that, if they did so, Fort Sheridan would not be on the closure list. They would understand that a viable Reserve component is important to our Nation's defense, larger now than our active duty forces, that the training at Fort Sheridan of 74,000 National Guardsmen and the command of 54,000 reservists is important to that Reserve component, that having 4th Army headquarters and the Recruit Command, the entire recruiting apparatus of the U.S. Army, at Fort Sheridan was an important place to have them and that, at the bottom line, that in the event our Nation needed to mobilize, that Fort Sheridan would be essential to being together, to muster, large numbers of troops in the Midwest as it has always done throughout its entire 100-year history.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I knew that the Commissioners would understand that Fort Sheridan was a beautiful, historic fort, that Holibird and Roche designed the buildings when Holibird was a young architect in his twenties and went on to become one of Chicago's most famous architects, that Gen. George Patton lived here, was a lieutenant when he lived at Fort Sheridan, that one of his children was born here and that the fort had a very rich history in addition to being a place of beauty.

In fact, when the Commission came to deciding about Fort Sheridan, they found that it did not meet their own formula for closing that in fact it had a high military utility rating of 8 out of 10, that it was fourth among the administrative headquarters installations, ahead of 10 others that were in fact not closed on the final base closure list of 86. But it was put on the closure list anyway, Mr. Chairman. It was put on the closure list anyway.

Why was that so, Mr. Chairman? Why would it have been there when it did not meet the criterion of the Commission's own closure standards? Well, we found out about 10 days ago when they declassified the Commission's deliberations, Mr. Chairman, and there are 2,000 pages of transcript; it says in their deliberations. "If we had Fort Sheridan, which everybody says has got to be closed," it's been in every piece I've ever read, one of the Commissioners said that, "Fort Sheridan is doomed. Now, if we have that, you will have to testify," speaking to the Chairman of the Commission having to testify, "that it failed the formula, but that we added it because our gut said that it ought to be added."

One of the Commissioners in another part of the testimony said, "What could you sell it for? What did your studies show you could sell it for?

Staff: "We didn't have land value there."

Commissioner: "You didn't do land value?"

Staff: "Because it was up there we didn't do any analysis of it because it was up there."

At another point they demean the city of Chicago and many of its citizens when they say on relocating the 4th Army, "If they go to South Chicago, we could give them combat pay."

Very frankly it took us a great deal of time to get this information because the Department of Defense stonewalled our requests, as they stonewalled every Member's request for information about how the Commission came to its conclusions, and finally, after putting this kind of information in a secret status where Members could see it but not divulge it, they finally decided that it was not really necessary to have it classified at all, so finally, about 10 days ago, DOD released it.

Prior to getting that information we had joined in a request for a GAO study of the Commission's work. Were the cost savings real or not? If not, obviously this Congress, this House of Representatives, should not support the Commission's work.

The GAO did as good a job as they possibly could in a very short period of time. But they did not complete their analysis and their report would not be finished until, we are told, sometime in the fall. They did spend 3 weeks at Fort Sheridan with a team, but the complete data and analysis are not yet available.

We are voting today in the dark. We do not have the information on which we can make an intelligence judgment about the Commission's work.

We did find out some things about it, though. For example, the Commission said that new construction to move 4th Army and the Recruiting Command to Fort Benjamin Harrison under their plan would cost \$26.8 million. The GAO says, no, that it will cost \$85.3 million. They are off by a factor of three. The relocation costs: The Commission said \$11.4 million; the GAO said at least \$25 million, off by a factor of at least two. In force reduction the Commission said that we are going to save 746 positions if we close Fort Sheridan. GAO says we might save 172 positions. On the transportation costs, not considered by the Commission, the commanding general of the Recruiting Command told me last week that if you move the command down to Fort Benjamin Harrison, they will continue to require about 3,000 flights per year in the pursuit of recruiting for the U.S. Army, and all of those flights are going to go out of the Indianapolis airport and most are going to have to come through O'Hare at great additional

cost, but no one on the Commission bothered to consider this.

The bottom line: The cost of moving could be as high as \$120 million, and, if so, they would not meet the 6-year payback requirement of the law.

The Commission said, "If we close Fort Sheridan, we're going to save \$40.8 million." GAO says, "If you close Fort Sheridan, you may save \$17.6 million a year." That would not meet the 6-year payback.

But, Mr. Chairman, we do not have a complete GAO analysis on all of the bases. We have a partial analysis on some of them. So, Mr. Chairman, we do not have a bottom line, and to convince Members of the House and to convince Members of the Senate that the report should be rejected we really do have to have complete information and an independent analysis.

There are further quotes that seem important to me:

On the sale of land the Commissioners said, "We invented the property values." On the Commissioners' view of their own work: "Let's don't admit we've done a lousy job." On military utility standards, the standards by which bases would be judged, "Change the scores."

These are not the words of an objective, fair, and honest Commission charged by the Congress to bring forward a nonbiased list of bases to be closed.

□ 1410

This is not a Commission that did a job for the American people. The Commission did not have the courage to stand up and tell the truth about Fort Sheridan. The Commission was gutless, afraid to stand up to the national media and say that this base, in truth, should not be on the list because it does not meet the Commission's own base closing standards.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission concept was a fair and correct concept. We do need to address the wise and efficient expenditure of taxpayers' money. We do need to address our Nation's defense outside of a purely political context, but we have the right to expect from the people that we charge with this responsibility in advising Congress, we have the right to expect competence. We have the right to expect honesty and we have the right to expect fairness.

What we got at Fort Sheridan and the evidence is exactly the same at Chanute where they said the base was deficient in the very things for which the base was being recognized by the Department of the Air Force, we got bias.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, on our side, we yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this further time.

Mr. Chairman, in Fort Sheridan and Chanute we got bias. We got uninformed judgment. We got an unintelligent approach to a very, very important decision.

Obviously, regarding this base, at least, the Commission has not done the job we charged them with doing and we ought to reject it.

I know the difficulty of that. The vast majority of the Members of the House of Representatives are not affected by the Base Closure Commission's work. The full GAO report is not ready, so we cannot have an independent and definite appraisal regarding the entire work product of the Commission that would show the Congress that they have not done overall the job that we charged them with doing.

Mr. Chairman, at the bottom line the House ought to look at the record that we have and understand that there is before us a substantial body of information that leads us to the conclusion that the Commission acted improperly, outside the scope of the law which created them, and certainly not in a way that we can point to with pride and say that this work was done intelligently, fairly, and honestly.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I recommend to the House that they reject the Commission's work, support the resolution of disapproval, and send them back to the drawing board to do the work that we required them to do and to do it in an honest, fair, and unbiased manner.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELY].

Mr. MACHTELY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the resolution of disapproval of the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more pressing an issue before us today than the need to cut wasteful Federal spending. My constituents, along with Americans everywhere, have been sending Congress a very clear message that it is time to get serious about deficit reduction. Americans will simply no longer tolerate \$150 billion deficits and a national debt of \$2.7 trillion.

While closing unnecessary military installations is not by itself going to end our fiscal problems, it is an important step which we have a unique opportunity to take. Obsolete military bases for too long have drained scarce Federal resources, and Congress acted properly last year in passing legislation to expedite closing them. As one who served in the Navy for more than 5 years, I clearly understand that an abundance of military installations

does not necessarily serve the interests of national defense.

No one, including myself, is suggesting that the recommendations of the Base Closure Commission are perfect. We can certainly all find some area of disagreement with nearly every matter which comes before the floor of this body. However, these recommendations offer Congress the only viable option for cutting truly unnecessary expenditures of Federal funds, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this effort to disapprove them.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this resolution of disapproval, but I do want to go on record as saying that this Commission left a lot to be desired.

The U.S. Navy stonewalled the Commission, it appears, and took hardly any hits at all. The Army got away with closing no serious installations at all, while two parts of our country, the State of California and the U.S. Air Force took unbelievably serious hits. The two bases in the southern California area, Norton, a key air transportation command center, a key part of the newly formed transportation command, a great part of the military airlift command, and George Air Force Base, where I flew for most of my career F-100 Supersabers, one of the finest fighter bases in the whole world, to have these bases closed just seems incredible.

I know we have to start somewhere. I know this Congress and the other body did not have the guts to face up to this and apply all the skills in this House to share the pain here properly. We did in the blind, as we have done a lot of things by commission, but I hope the Air Force will consider keeping a part of George Air Force Base open as an Air National Guard facility. When I was assigned to that base in 1955, I thought I was arriving on the greatest base in the world, and yet now there is a new hospital, a new chapel, a new administration building, a new enlisted men's club, new pool facilities, computer facilities, simulators for advanced jet aircraft, a new officers' club; it is phenomenal to me in that area of the country where we first broke the sound barrier, where Edwards Air Force Base is, where Palmdale Air Force facility is, that one of the prime fighter bases of the world with 363 good flying days a year is going to close down. Its proximity to the Army National Training Center at Barstow, everything indicated this base should not have been touched, but so be it.

I will support the decision of the Commission with some anger and hope

that the next time we do this that we do it with a little more skill.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the base closing recommendations, which will provide us with much-needed cost savings by closing military bases that are no longer necessary for the security of our Nation. This measure is estimated to save approximately \$693 million in fiscal year 1990 alone, making a significant contribution to our deficit-reduction efforts.

I would also like to make one important point about the recommended base closings. They will, indeed, save large sums of taxpayer dollars. But there is a way to save even more money in the long run—by making the closed bases available to States and the appropriate Federal agencies for conversion into prison facilities or drug treatment centers.

If the Federal prison facilities in other States are like those in New York, and I know they are, more space is critical to fighting an effective war against crime and drugs. New York has three Federal installations, two are at nearly double their capacity while the third is at more than twice its intended level. Nationwide, Federal prisons are between 37 and 73 percent over their capacities. The pressure from overcrowding is building, resulting in increased pressure for early releases which are, in many cases, totally inappropriate.

From 1980 to 1987, total U.S. prison population, including State and Federal prisoners, increased from slightly over 300,000 to almost 600,000. This jump in prison population is not just the result of more crime. Since 1980 the number of incarcerations compared with reported crimes has risen steadily. In 1980, 25 offenders were committed to prison for every 1,000 murders, manslaughters, rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults, and burglaries reported to the police. In 1986, 43 people were incarcerated for every 1,000 such offenses.

This trend of increased enforcement needs to continue. But there is a very real and serious constraint—space.

In addition, the need for drug treatment facilities is unquestioned. To win the war on drugs we must fight it from both the supply and demand sides. Fifty-one percent of the cocaine consumed in America is being used by only 10 percent of cocaine addicts. Demand for cocaine is clearly driving the supply.

But, even if an addict wants to get out of the cycle of addiction, treatment is available for very few of those who need it—6.5 million addicts need help to break the habit. Two million of those addicts are willing to pay for

available, affordable treatment every year. But there are only 250,000 treatment slots available nationwide. Even if an addict wants to rid his life of drugs, the chances of finding treatment are slim and delays can often cost lives in this deadly business. We can't win this war on drugs without curbing demand. Affordable, available treatment is critical if we seriously want to win that war. Converting at least some of these closing military bases into drug treatment centers would be a major contribution to that end.

Closing and realigning our unneeded military facilities will save large sums of taxpayer dollars, and for that we must be thankful. But I believe we can do even better. I believe that converting the closed bases into Federal or State prisons or drug treatment centers will help us respond to the dangerous national shortage of prison space—a shortage that will prove extremely expensive and risky if we do not act now.

Mr. Chairman, let's give serious consideration to turning these bases into prisons and drug treatment centers.

□ 1440

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN].

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the Base Closure Commission are flawed and based on inaccurate, out-of-date information. The process has not served us well. The transcripts have become an embarrassment for the Commission and the Congress.

As pointed out in the debate last week, the Commission transcripts show that data was invented and substantially altered in order to meet their proposed recommendations.

Speaking from these transcripts, here are three examples.

Could a base be closed that did not meet the savings test, "I think we have some room to do that because what we do is we change the way. We go back into the arrays. This may sound complicated to you, but you go back in and you change things." "But you'd be changing the formula." "No. You'd be changing the scores."

"This says that we evaluated all bases against five factors. We didn't do that. As a matter of fact, there were 2,000 bases we didn't look at against any factors."

Commission members, the military services, and the General Accounting Office have all acknowledged that there are major errors in the recommendations. GAO says 84 percent have to come from reduction in personnel, but the Commission recommends that these people just be moved.

Chanute Air Force Base should not be on any closure list. It does not meet

the criteria set by the commission. It is clear from the transcripts that commission members were not familiar with Chanute. No one from the commission took the time to see Chanute firsthand, no staff, no communication of any kind. Deficient? 80 awards—44 to Chanute. Yet, Chanute is the second costliest base to close and the economic impact on this rural area of central Illinois will be devastating. The Commission says the economic impact would be minimal. Chanute represents one-half of the population; one-third of all the homes are owned by Chanute personnel; 65 percent of elementary students are children of Chanute personnel.

The base closure law was enacted because Congress was told that cost savings could be achieved. In fact, very little money is going to be saved, if any savings are realized at all. There is a home buy-out program that was not looked at, and nobody from the commission visited Chanute to find out what the cost was until 2 months after the Commission released its report. There is a joint sewer system, brand new, that has to be bought out by the Department of Defense.

The base closure account is not going to be self-sustaining because the savings simply are not there. If Congress accepts these closure recommendations, then Congress is going to have to accept the funding realities and responsibilities involved. Too many major expenses associated with closure were not considered by the Commission. Even today, no one knows what the true dollar cost will be.

No one knows the cost of what will be lost if we embrace these flawed recommendations. What will be lost is a readiness training capability already in place and already paid for. What will suffer is the quality of life our military men and women deserve. Without this quality of life standard, which has been recognized and funded by the Congress during this past decade, the All-Volunteer Force faces serious problems in recruiting and retaining qualified experienced personnel.

The concerns voiced by Members during this debate are too substantial to be dismissed as simply parochial interests. I will be happy to meet with any Member before the vote today to detail the serious inaccuracies regarding Chanute Air Force Base. I urge my colleagues to reject the Commission's flawed and very expensive recommendations and to vote for the motion of disapproval.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, when it was originally con-

sidered by the House in October of last year, I voted for the bill creating a commission to recommend closing military installations.

Most everyone wants Government to cut expenses and balance the budget, but no one wants the cuts in their own back yard. The main reason the Base Closing Commission was formed was to circumvent a Congress that is willing to accept any Government expense to secure benefits for the home district.

For more than 10 years, no military bases have been closed primarily due to political, not military reasons. This was a situation that Congress clearly felt was intolerable and that had to be changed. The establishment of a non-partisan Commission of experts to examine and recommend bases for closure was, in my view, probably the best solution to deal with this difficult political problem.

Although I supported this legislation, I frankly did not expect the Commission would recommend the closure of Pease Air Force Base, which is located in the district I represent, the First District of New Hampshire. For more than 30 years, Pease has been at the forefront of our national defense. It has received numerous awards and commendations, and currently serves as the home of the 509th Bombardment Wing as well as the 157th Air Refueling Group of the Air National Guard. Given its history and contribution to our national defense, I did not believe the Commission would abandon Pease completely.

Therefore, when the Commission announced its recommendations, my initial reaction was one of shock and dismay. No Member of Congress wants to see his or her district lose a major military base or any other major Federal installation. It is a natural reaction for each of us to ensure our constituents are not cheated and get their fair share from the Federal Government. I am also certain that there are other bases left off the Commission's list that should have been on it.

After voting to create a commission to select military bases for closure, I now find myself in painful position of having a base in my own district on the list. The easy vote for me would be to vote to reject the Commission's recommendations and save Pease Air Force Base in New Hampshire. That would be the easy vote—but it would not be the right vote. It is that type of parochial attitude that has led to America's \$2 trillion national debt and has reduced America to a "government by commission."

The people of New Hampshire sent me to Congress to be fiscally conservative and to protect and promote our national security. Supporting the base closure recommendations does both. The closure of the 86 bases on the list

makes sense from a strategic as well as a financial viewpoint.

The Commission recommended the closure of Pease because the military value of Pease is, in its words, "lower than other strategic-bomber bases because of low pre-launch survivability from submarine-launched ballistic missiles." I know of no military experts that have disputed this analysis. Indeed, if Pease is left open, it would be the only strategic bomber base located along either the Atlantic or Pacific coast. All other strategic bomber bases are located inland, and for good reason.

While I have not examined the Commission's analysis of other bases as closely as I have examined Pease, I do not believe that the Commission made mistakes of such magnitude that they would warrant rejection of all of their recommendations.

There might have been some miscalculations, but overall I feel the Commission did a good job and that their recommendation will strengthen, not weaken our national defense. If this were not the case, I am confident that then-Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci or the House Armed Services Committee would have rejected this list.

I also believe the Commission's recommendations provide us with an excellent opportunity to achieve savings without weakening our national defense. While the Commission may have underestimated some costs and did not include others, such as environmental cleanup costs, the fact is that GAO, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 12 stated that substantial savings will occur if we move forward with reductions in military personnel. Specifically, with regard to Pease, GAO's revised projections estimate annual savings of \$88.9 million, only \$7 million less than the Commission's estimate. Also, any costs that are necessary to close the base, will be essentially one-time costs while the savings will last for a lifetime. In short, the opportunity to achieve savings is there. We just have to have the courage to take advantage of it.

While I will support the recommendations of the Commission, I intend to hold the Air Force's feet to the fire on a number of matters that will directly impact the citizens and towns affected by the closure of Pease.

First, the Air Force must take full responsibility for cleaning up any environmental problems at Pease, specifically the problems of contamination of the drinking water supply, potential hazardous waste sites, the condition of the wastewater treatment plant, and the possibility of leaky underground storage tanks.

Second, while the primary mission of a military base is to defend America, not to provide benefits to retirees,

military retirees have sacrificed for our country and their needs should not be ignored. I would hope that the Department of Defense could make some arrangement to keep the hospital open in order to continue to serve our retirees.

Third, and most importantly, the Department of Defense and the Air Force must work closely with the towns affected by the closure in order to ensure a smooth transition at Pease. Already a local redevelopment commission has been formed to address the fate of the land and facilities at Pease, and they are doing an excellent job. However, there are a maze of laws governing the base closure process, and the Air Force needs to work closely with the commission to answer any questions they may have and to ensure that they understand the base closing process.

The closing of a military base certainly presents a major challenge to the community in which it is located, but I believe it should be looked upon as an opportunity, not a problem. If the local, State, and Federal Governments can all work together, I am confident that the closing of Pease can actually work toward the economic and social advantage of the region. I for one intend to make sure that all agencies of the Federal Government extend their fullest cooperation to the government of New Hampshire and the Pease Redevelopment Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the people of New Hampshire are proud, independent, fiscally conservative, and patriotic. When Pease Air Force Base opened in New Hampshire in 1956, it opened because we wanted and needed that base for our national security. New Hampshire was proud to contribute to our military readiness. We in New Hampshire don't look upon Pease as a pork-barrel project or a jobs program. We don't measure our successes by how much money comes to us from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, Pease has been part of the seacoast of New Hampshire for 33 years. We are proud of its mission and feel privileged that we could contribute to our national security. We are saddened that soon Pease will no longer be a part of us, but prepared to accept the decision.

Mr. Chairman, 33 years ago the citizens of New Hampshire opened Pease Air Force Base to promote our national security. We are now ready to close it for our national security.

I urge a "no" vote on House Joint Resolution 165.

□ 1430

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, last week during the considerable debate on this resolution, I spoke at great length about the recommendations and some of the information, used to arrive at those recommendations. I said then, as I have said throughout, that I would withhold my decision about a vote until we had all the information available, more specifically until I had an opportunity to hear the briefing from the General Accounting Office which has been looking into the Base Closing Commission's recommendations.

I received that briefing yesterday. Unfortunately, they have not been able to get on the ground at either Fort Huachuca or Fort Devens, MA, the two bases involved in the particular swap that I have had questions about.

However, in my discussions with the GAO and with what we heard last week on the floor, it is very apparent there are serious flaws in the Commission's work. I think this may be indicative of the quality of the entire report. For instance, there was a major error found in the data at Fort Dix. Part of it was a transmission error and part of it was a very simple typographical error. The fort amended the information 4 days later. The new information never got into the Commission's consideration. If it had, instead of being ranked seven out of eight this group in terms of viability as a base, Fort Dix would have been ranked first out of the TRADOC posts.

Further, my staff, when they looked at the transcript of the Commission's deliberations, found there were errors in the numbers of people that were involved in the swap between Fort Huachuca and Fort Devens, MA. Most startling, however, was a small error she found in another State relating to another service. The Commission staff indicated a particular facility was in one State when it was actually in another. A discussion of several minutes ensued concerning whether one base's mission could be moved to the other when the first facility closed. There were factual errors about the location, the length of the runway, and the weather conditions. Most startling was the fact that it was never mentioned during the discussion that one was an Air Force base and one was a Navy base. The Commission decided not to close one of the facilities and then merge the two, with very different missions, based partly on the statement of one commissioner that the Navy base is in really a nifty town and is a good place to live.

In the GAO briefing on the situation at Fort Huachuca, they stated their concern there was \$200 million stated as a given in the land sale at Fort Meade to pay for this particular move. However, the law does not allow for that. Congress may change the law to

permit the land sale, but it does not permit it now. Therefore, there is no \$200 million that can be considered a given. The State of Maryland may well want to have the land at Fort Meade.

Overall, the General Accounting Office has estimated the predicted savings of each of the components of the swap has been overestimated by about \$10 million, though they concede there are significant savings overall to be realized.

Mr. Chairman, I had not made up my mind about how I would vote on this until I had all of the information in hand. However, based on the information we have, and more importantly based on the information we do not have, I think this body would be well advised to reject these recommendations. We should urge the Defense Department to go back and come up with more serious recommendations, recommendations that this body can support.

Mr. Chairman, I include with my remarks the briefings by the Information Systems Command after the decision was announced which clearly shows the cost savings the Commission suggested would be realized are not there.

BRIEFING BY U.S. ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND, FEBRUARY 21, 1989, CONCERNING COST EFFECTIVENESS OF RECOMMENDATION TO CONSOLIDATE INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND AT FORT DEVENS, MA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this briefing is two fold. First, to present the updated USAISC cost estimate, and second, to present several serious short falls in both the Commission's model and report which will have dramatic impact upon DA and DOD.

The cost estimate presented there today is version 4, that is the fourth iteration of the overall costing effort. All four have been in the \$500 million ballpark for one time costs and in excess of \$20 million dollars for annual recurring costs.

The following table shows both the total dollar estimate of this iteration and a comparison of the USAISC estimated costs to those presented by the Commission in their study.

ISC/ISD MOVE—COST SUMMARY

(In millions of dollars)

	Recommended solution			Commission study costs as published
	Rehab Fort Devens barracks area w/o Vicksburg	Rehab Fort Huachuca w/some const	Total relation costs	
One-time costs:				
Construction.....	95	162	257	102
IMA requirements.....	39	1	40	0
Equipment moves.....	9	3	12	2
Personnel moves.....	104	6	110	83
Transition.....	42	Note 3	42	36
Contract support.....	1	NA	1	0
Other.....	8	0	8	5
Total one time.....	298	172	470	228
Recurring annual:				
Premium pay 1.....	2	NA	2	0
Contract support.....	21	NA	21	0
Base ops/staff sp.....	1	7	8	1
Space shavings/mil 2.....	1	(1)	0	(19)

ISC/ISD MOVE—COST SUMMARY—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Recommended solution			Commission study costs as published
	Rehab Fort Devens barracks area w/o Vicksburg	Rehab Fort Huachuca w/some const	Total relation costs	
Total recurring.....	25	6	31	(18)

Note 1.—Annex G premium pay addresses two alternatives; the higher costs alternative is displayed.

Note 2.—Space savings/military entitlements Annex I displays unsubstantiated personnel savings estimated by the Commission, thus they were excluded here.

Note 3.—Only minimal transition costs for ISD have been identified at this time as related to the ISC part of the realignment.

This table shows the total costs which have been estimated for both the move of ISC to Fort Devens and ISD to Fort Huachuca. These are totaled in the third column and compared to the Commission's cost estimates as directly as possible using the fourth column. It must be noted that the lack of detail within the Commission's report made some comparison impossible, hence the "other" category.

Those areas where there are great differences will be addressed in detail during this briefing.

ISC/ISD MOVE—MANPOWER

Location	USAISC to Devens			USAISC to Huachuca		
	Mil.	Civ.	Total	Mil.	Civ.	Total
Huachuca.....	765	1,326	2,091	0	0	0
Belvoir.....	134	606	740	0	0	0
Monmouth.....	65	299	364	0	0	0
Devens.....	0	0	0	1,156	263	1,264
Students.....	0	0	0	1,760	0	1,760
Total.....			3,195			3,024
Devens augment.....			126			

The single biggest factor in the estimation of the costs associated with this relocation is the number of spaces being relocated to and from Forts Huachuca and Devens. This table shows the numbers which have come to be known as the USAISC-recommended manpower strengths. These numbers take into account the FY 1988 TDA authorizations and the need to retain the Software Development Center, Washington in the DC area due to the number of activities this organization supports which are collocated in the Washington area.

Most of the numbers are self explanatory. The Devens augment represents those personnel who will be relocated to Fort Devens to increase the current garrison strength. This will bring the Devens garrison to a manning level which will allow it to adequately support an Army MACOM.

ISC/ISO MOVE—CONSTRUCTION

USAISC construction rehabilitation requirements

USAISC will take over two buildings currently under construction at Fort Devens.

Brick barracks buildings on Fort Devens will be rehabilitated for use by ISC elements.

The Vicksburg Square area will not be rehabilitated but will be backfilled by other existing Fort Devens activities.

USAISC construction rehabilitation requirements

USAISC will take over one building currently under construction at Fort Huachuca.

Greely Hall and other buildings vacated by ISC elements will be rehabilitated for use by ISD elements.

Some new construction will be required, however as of the date of this briefing the actual quantity has not been identified.

During earlier analyses three construction scenarios were engineered and costed. For the purposes of this briefing those scenarios have been narrowed to one.

Construction here include both construction and rehabilitation of existing facilities at Fort Huachuca and Fort Devens.

For the ISC move, two buildings currently under construction at Fort Devens will be completed and used to house ISC personnel. In addition to this a number of brick barracks buildings will be rehabilitated and used to house the remainder of ISC assets. The buildings in what is known as the Vicksburg Square will not be rehabilitated. But rather backfilled by existing Fort Devens organizations.

The ISD move will include the use of one building currently under construction at Fort Huachuca. This building will be used to house ISD personnel. In addition to this building, Greely Hall, which houses the majority of ISC assets at Fort Huachuca, will be rehabilitated once those assets vacate. This building is expected to be used for classroom facilities. There will be some additional construction required under this plan, however, the amount of that additional construction has yet to be determined.

ISC/ISO MOVE—COST DRIVERS

(Dollars in millions)

Cost driver	Most likely cost	Percent of total	Key factors
One-time costs.....	\$462	100	
Construction rehab.....	257	56	Number of personnel, amount of new construction and rehabilitation.
Personnel moves.....	104	23	Number of personnel and spaces due to relocate.
Annual recurring costs.....	31	100	
Contract support.....	21	68	Cost of contract hours number of contract hours required, availability of government labor force.
Premium pay.....	2	7	Types of personnel to receive premium pay, rate of premium pay.

This table shows the major cost drivers associated with the costing, and their relative percentage of the overall costs of the ISC/ISD relocation. There are two primary cost drivers associated with each category of cost. It should be noted that these are not the only costs associated with this relocation, just the ones with the greatest single effect.

One time cost drivers include construction and rehabilitation at \$257 million which represents 56 percent of the total one time costs, and personnel moves at \$104 million which represents 23 percent of the total one time costs. These two drivers combined account for almost 80 percent of the total one time costs and are both heavily dependent upon the number of spaces being relocated. For the purposes of this briefing we have used the personnel numbers shown earlier.

Annual recurring cost drivers include contract support at \$31 million which represents 68 percent of the total recurring costs, and premium pay at \$2 million which represents 7 percent of the total recurring costs. These two drivers combined represent 75 percent of the total recurring costs. Contract support costs are dependent upon the higher cost of contract labor in the Fort

Devens area compared to the Fort Huachuca area and the amount of contract work required by USAISC at its new location. The amount of contract work required is in turn dependent upon the availability of qualified, trained personnel for hire into those spaces which are vacant within USAISC after the relocation. The premium pay costs are dependent upon the number of personnel who will receive this benefit and the basic rate above their current salary which will be paid as a premium incentive.

ISC/ISO MOVE—SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

(Dollars in millions)

Cost driver	Cost range				
	Low	Percent change	Most likely	High	Percent change
Effect on total one-time costs.....	\$436	-5	\$462	\$488	+5
Construction/rehab.....	231	-10	257	283	+10
Effect on total one-time costs.....	452	-2	462	472	+2
Personnel moves.....	94	-10	104	114	+10
Effect on annual recurring costs.....	29	-6	31	33	+6
Contract support.....	19	-10	21	23	+10
Effect on annual recurring costs.....	31	0	31	31	0
Premium pay.....	2	-10	2	2	+10

This table represents the outcome of a cursory sensitivity analysis. The purpose of such an analysis is to determine the overall effect on total cost if one of several cost driver values is varied by a certain percentage. This enables us to identify those cost drivers whose accuracy will have a definitive impact on the credibility of our estimate.

For the purposes of this briefing the low value represents a 10 percent reduction in cost and the high value represents a 10 percent increase in the cost of the particular driver.

As this is an exercise in identifying the impact of variations in a single cost driver, only one cost driver is increased/decreased at a time to maintain the empirical testing methodology required in sensitivity analysis.

As shown, reducing the construction/rehabilitation cost driver by 10 percent has the effect of reducing overall relocation costs by 5 percent. Similarly, increasing the construction/rehabilitation cost by 10 percent has the effect of increasing overall costs by only 5 percent. This tells us that the overall cost is relatively sensitive to any sizable changes in the construction/rehabilitation costs, and as this cost is based on the number of spaces relocated, that number must be as accurate as possible to provide the most accurate overall cost possible. We feel that the numbers used in our calculations are the most accurate possible, and therefore our construction costs are also the most accurate possible.

The same logic holds true for personnel move costs which when varied by 10 percent effected total costs by only approximately 2 percent in either direction. This is not considered significant and therefore overall costs are not considered sensitive to changes in this driver unless those changes should become drastic, say 30 to 40 percent.

For recurring costs, the only cost driver with any effect on overall relocation cost was the contract support. When varied by 10 percent, this driver had an overall effect on recurring costs of plus or minus 6 percent. This leads to the determination that total recurring costs are rather sensitive to changes in contract support dollars. As this cost driver is based on the number of contract hours required by USAISC and the cost of these hours in the Fort Devens area,

these two factors must be as accurate as possible. The number required is an historical factor and therefore very accurate. The cost of contracting hours is also an historical factor provided by units currently contracting for similar services in the Fort Devens area, and is therefore also very accurate.

To sum up the sensitivity analysis effort and findings, those cost drivers which are responsible for the majority of the costs associated with this relocation are very accurate. Therefore, the same can be said of the overall estimate.

ISC/ISO MOVE—COSTS NOT CONSIDERED BY BASE CLOSER/REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

(In millions of dollars)

Cost category	Estimated cost to Federal Government
One time costs:	
Information management area costs.....	\$40
Contract support.....	1
Systems furniture.....	8
Environmental restoration.....	51
Disposal assistance.....	(7)
Total one-time costs.....	100+
Annual recurring costs:	
Premium pay.....	2
Contract support.....	21
Total recurring costs.....	22

During the creation of our estimate, we were required to examine the Commission report and model to determine which costs and cost factors were used therein and insure we had not ourselves omitted any expected costs.

In the course of this examination, certain costs were identified which were not addressed by the Commission either in their basic cost estimate or in the pay back calculations which followed.

The one time costs omitted by the model include:

The IMA costs shown here consist of such necessary items as telephone switch purchase and installation, installation of a local area network, creation of a video teleconferencing facility, and basic communications plant (trunks) upgrades which must be made to Fort Devens before USAISC can hope to conduct normal operations at that site. The Commission model did not address this cost at all.

I briefly explained contract support earlier, and will only point out that the Commission model made no attempt to address this cost.

Fort Huachuca, especially Greely Hall which houses the majority of the administrative work force and the command headquarters, has recently converted its space to systems furniture at some sizable cost. This furniture is currently under warranty and if relocated would have to be deinstalled, transported, and reinstalled by Westinghouse contractor personnel. This being the case, and understanding that systems furniture is designed for each specific work area, it would be more cost effective to purchase new systems furniture and have it installed at Fort Devens than to attempt to relocate the existing furniture with the command. The Commission did, in fact, allow some administrative furniture moving costs. However, the amount allowed in the model will not be sufficient to relocate our files and safes. The costs shown by the Commission would

not be sufficient to move any desks we may have had in the past.

The Commission was chartered to consider the possible closure of facilities and the relocation of others which would be in the best interest of the Army. Part of their consideration was to be the environmental impact of clean up of hazardous materials. Section 204, paragraph (a)(3) of Pub. L. 100-526 (the law creating the Commission) states that funds for these clean up efforts would be "appropriated to the Department of Defense." This means that any cost to clean up would be a cost to the Federal Government, and more specifically to DOD proper. As the sale of Fort Meade was included in the ISC/ISD relocation the costs associated with that clean up must be included as a cost of the relocation. The Commission ignored this cost.

This section of the law also allows for the Department of Defense to seek assistance in the disposal, or sale, or property. If this is done, the costs associated with this assistance must be reimbursed. The Commission did not address this cost.

The annual recurring costs not considered by the Commission are:

Premium Pay: The Commission model does not have the capability to address the additional cost of premium or incentive pay given to employees in high cost areas. This shortfall in the model made it impossible for the Commission to address premium pay like that currently authorized for GS-OB and below employees at Fort Devens.

Contract Support: This is a very important cost to the relocation as USAISC is heavily supported by contractor personnel. The validity of this cost was discussed during the sensitivity analysis portion of my presentation.

The omission of one time costs exceeding 50 percent of the Commission's cost estimate of one time cost and over 200 percent of the recurring cost by the Commission could easily result in the Department of Defense being presented with a multibillion-dollar bill with no funds available or appropriated for payment.

ISC/ISD MOVE—ISSUES NOT ADDRESSED BY BASE CLOSER/REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

Issue	Estimated impact
Disposal of property.....	Increased cost to DOD. No reimbursement.
Funding of the Commission recommendations.	Severe under estimation—budgetary short falls. Must fund for all costs to the Federal Government.
Critical payback period calculations.	Inability to reimburse fund. Inability to complete required moves by FY 1995. If realistic costs considered—ISC/ISD move never recoup expenditures. Actual payback period is year 15.

This table sums up the key issues which we feel were not addressed by the Commission in its report. These must be addressed and definitive answers provided to important questions stemming from these issues before any serious work can begin on the recommended closures and relocations.

The disposal of property is basis for the majority of the savings presented by the Commission. This savings does not address any costs associated with environmental restoration or clean up. Environmental restoration, in fact, represents a sizable cost to the Department of Defense, and the funding of that cost must be identified early on to avoid any decrement in DOD funding to cover the Commission's oversight. Section 204 of Public Law 100-526 also allows the Secretary of Defense to "transfer such

property, facility, or portion, without reimbursement" to any department or other instrumentality (including NAF). If this is to be done, then the savings projected by the Commission report will not materialize. Other difficulties with legal claims to the lands proposed for sale were not considered by the Commission, and given their task and the time frame this is understandable. However, these considerations will have dramatic impact on the savings projected by the Commission and must be considered before any further actions are taken into effect the recommended closures and relocations.

The funding required for the Commission's recommendations was not addressed in the study. However, realistic costs of these recommendations must first be identified. Our efforts have concluded that the Commission has severely underestimated the cost of the ISC/ISD one time relocation by approximately \$234 million or 81 percent. The recurring costs created by the Commission for this effort have been underestimated by approximately \$49 million or 272 percent for each year following the relocation. Under normal conditions estimates which fluctuate 25 percent are required by DA and DOD guidance to be recreated and validated by an independent agency.

This underestimation could result in either the requirement for DOD to decrement their already reduced budget to fund for the short falls, or the postponement of relocation efforts past the FY 1995 target date. Either would be unacceptable to Congress, and the former would stand the best chance of being reality if these estimates are not corrected before the Commission's recommendations become law.

There are those costs of the Commission report which fall outside DA. As all public funds for Federal Government must originate with Congress, we must insure that we have estimated all costs associated with the recommended closure and relocations when presenting the total bill to Congress. This type of estimate would preclude difficulties such as I have already discussed as we move towards implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission used as its yardstick the break even point of each closure or relocation. This point was calculated using net present value techniques the in-depth understanding of which is not key to grasping the problem with the report as written. However, for your benefit I will provide a cursory explanation. In essence this method uses inflation factors and discount rates to set all dollar values equal. That is to say a dollar spent today is worth as much as a dollar saved today, and we must insure that we don't try to pay back our investments with cheaper, future dollars. The resultant costs and savings are accumulated by year until all costs have been exceeded by expected savings. The key to successful use of this method is the accurate estimation of all costs associated with the effort being evaluated and the accurate and realistic estimation of all savings to be realized from the same effort.

The Commission in its charter was given a six year pay back as a rule of thumb. Any closures or relocations whose savings would not exceed its costs within six years after the completion of the effort were not to be favorably considered. The ISC/ISD relocation was estimated in the Commission's report to reach its break even or pay back point sometime in that sixth year.

I have pointed out any number of fallacies in the Commission's cost and savings esti-

mation. These fallacies will have dramatic effects on this pay back period, and in fact if the \$31 million annual recurring costs to the Department of Defense will insure that this relocation will never pay for its one time expenditures.

If, for the sake of argument, we assume the Commission has accurately estimated its \$18 million annual savings, and include the \$51 million clean up costs and the \$12 million addition mistake found in the Commission model's personnel relocation costs, the resultant pay back will occur in the 15th year.

ISC/ISD MOVE—RECOMMENDATIONS

Accept USAISC cost estimate.

Analyze entire Commission study/report.

The estimate I have presented to you today represents the best possible cost and funding estimate available at this time. While these figures will undoubtedly change as events and assumptions continue to change, I would recommend that the current USAISC be accepted as the Army position and used for planning purposes. As more accurate assumptions and additional environmental changes are known, this estimate will be updated and provided through normal reporting chains for use in the planning and programming efforts.

There have been presented today a number of sizable omissions and over sights found, to be lacking from the Commission's cost estimates and estimated savings. These short falls have resulted in the understating of the ISC/ISD relocation one time costs by 81 percent or \$234 million and understating of annual recurring costs by 272 percent and showing an \$18 million savings when in fact there will be a \$31 million additional cost annually.

Whether or not these percentages or even these omissions and oversights can be applied to the overall Commission report and model is anyone's guess. My final recommendation is that we no longer allow this critical item to be allowed to be just a guess. Instead the Army should charter a valid analytical organization to review the entire study with the mission to either validate the costs and savings contained therein or identify omissions and short falls, which ever is the case.

This recommendation would without doubt require the expenditure of some minimal amount of Army funds. It would, however, be well worth the effort as the findings and estimates developed by this review team would enable the Army to adequately plan, program, and budget for any and all costs associated with the Commission's proposed closures and realignments.

Summary

One-time costs.....	\$462,000,000
Annual recurring costs	31,000,000

There has to date been a great deal of effort expended to develop a valid estimate of the costs and benefits associated with the ISC/ISD. What I have presented to you today is a valid, realistic estimation of what monies the Department of Defense will require to fund for this transfer or organizations. There exists a problem in that the Commission's estimate, severely underestimated as it is, is part of the recommendations which were provided to Congress, and will become law unless actions are taken quickly to alert Congress of these short falls. If we fail to do this, we stand to inherit the tasking to implement the recommended closures and relocations with severely inadequate funds for the required efforts.

For our portion of the Commission's recommendations, we have estimated \$462 million in one time costs and \$31 million in annual recurring costs. These figures have been subjected to sensitivity analyses, and the scrutiny of any number of highly qualified analysts. I believe these figures to be a true and unbiased representation of the funding requirements which will exist as a direct result of this relocation, and submit them to you for your scrutiny and eventual inclusion in the DOD planning and programming cycles. We must remember that proper and timely planning and programming will serve to preclude last minute decrement drills for OMA funds, and are the only way we in DA and DOD can hope to have adequate funds to operate our MACOMS after this relocation.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, let me at the outset express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 165 to disapprove the Base Closing Commission's recommendations. At the outset, I want commend all those on both sides of the aisle who were instrumental in passing the Defense Savings Act last year.

Military base closure is an issue on which Members of both parties can work together to reduce wasteful Pentagon spending. It is estimated that by passing base closing legislation, we could save between \$600 to \$700 million a year from the Defense budget without reducing our capability at all. If we are serious about trying to reduce the deficit and eliminate waste in Government, there is simply no excuse for not voting down this resolution of disapproval today.

Too often in the past, base closures have been a political rather than an economic or strategic issue. Members of Congress afraid of losing jobs in their district have been so successful in blocking base closings that no American base has been closed in the last 12 years. The Pentagon has also been accused of playing politics when preparing their list of bases to be closed by rewarding or punishing Members for votes. However, no one has questioned the credibility or professionalism of the Base Closing Commission. While some have disapproved of specific recommendations, it is clear that, for the most part, politics was not a factor in the Base Closing Commission's decisionmaking process.

Eliminating wasteful and unnecessary military spending and the political obstacles surrounding it are important for several reasons. Obviously, the budget deficit continues to be a major problem and cutting military spending without compromising national security is a critical component of any overall deficit reduction program. I want to note, that this same type of military spending reduction

can be made in many areas of the Defense budget, not just with military bases. This process could be facilitated by a program of economic conversion which I have been advocating and which is incorporated in H.R. 101, the Defense Adjustment Act of 1989.

Economic conversion helps address two fundamental imperatives in our society—the need to halt the nuclear arms race, and the need to reverse our Nation's current economic decline. It is the latter imperative which is so relevant to today's debate. Most Americans have been led to believe that military spending provides a stimulus to the economy, especially in the area of job creation, and a solution to economic ills. Indeed, this is why most Members of Congress are terrified of having a base close in their districts.

In fact, mainstream economists are beginning to realize that our Nation's overemphasis on military production is resulting in economic deterioration. The relationship between excessive military spending and economic problems such as declining productivity, a deteriorating infrastructure, high unemployment, and a lack of competitiveness is being exposed, and concerned Americans are beginning to realize that military spending is not the solution to the problem of industrial decline, but a chief cause. The public favors redirecting our policies to emphasize civilian production and international competitiveness, and it is economic conversion that will permit us to accomplish this in an orderly and economically efficient manner.

Economic conversion takes the precedent set by the Base Closing Commission and extends it to all defense-related enterprises. Our debate today proves that the role of job creation in spurring unnecessary defense spending is increasingly coming under close scrutiny. It does not require a huge leap of the imagination to understand that this problem pervades defense spending in general, not just spending on military bases. In fact, it is clear that we too often sacrifice opportunities for arms control simply because of the job creating power of weapons systems.

Just as most Members agree that politics should be removed from our policy on military bases, I hope that Members will also agree that it should be removed from defense spending decisions in general. With the repeated disclosures of Pentagon procurement scandals, many have come to realize that it is time to restore some sense to our defense decisions. By creating viable alternatives to military spending, economic conversion would assure the millions of workers in military-dependent industries that their jobs would not be sacrificed in the effort to achieve meaningful arms control. As a result, proposals for increased military spending would be more likely to be

assessed on their merits, rather than for reasons of job creation. This would significantly enhance the prospects for ending the nuclear arms race.

I am pleased to report that I have been working with Representatives MAVROULES, GEJDENSON, and OAKAR to develop a consensus bill on economic conversion. We have made great progress and have been informed by Chairwoman OAKAR that her Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization will begin hearings on economic conversion in a few weeks. I hope that we will be able to build on the work of Base Closing Commission and enact legislation which will apply the same antiwaste principle to all defense-related industries in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that the Base Closure Commission, during its review, chose to recommend three of the planned naval homeports for closure. I have spoken on many occasions of my concerns about the homeports, and specifically about the plan to base a homeport in New York Harbor. The General Accounting Office recommended 3 years ago that Congress require "a demonstration of the strategic benefits and more definitive and complete cost estimates before approving funds for the new homeports." No such demonstration has ever been made, but that has not stopped the Navy from proceeding with homeporting.

Former Senator Barry Goldwater, who along with our colleague, Mr. ARMEY, has been one of the most forceful spokesmen for base closing legislation over the years, called homeporting "one of the biggest political boondoggles I ever heard of." Indeed, it is perhaps one of the best examples of a case where politics rather than strategy or economics has determined the placement or status of a military base. There continues to be no convincing strategic rationale for the homeporting plan, and there continues to be no justification for the huge expenditures that have been and will continue to be required to construct homeports around the Nation.

It is therefore unfortunate that even in the seemingly nonpolitical atmosphere of the bipartisan Base Closing Commission, the Navy's homeporting plan may not have been fairly judged. Former Senator Thomas Eagleton, a member of the Commission, in an additional view included as part of the Commission's report, has said that the Navy stonewalled the Base-Closing Commission, allowing it to fare better than the Army or the Air Force on the list of cutbacks. Considering the lack of strategic rationale, the environmental problems, and the huge expenditures required for the three remaining homeports, it is conceivable that they too may have been recommended for

closure had the Navy given the Commission its full cooperation.

Senator Eagleton recommended that any future Base Closing Commission start by looking at the Navy, and I hope that such a Commission will be created and that it will seriously consider closing the Staten Island homeport. The Navy contended that it would not locate a homeport in an area where there is substantial community opposition, and yet opposition in New York City has been consistent, widespread, and adamant. Area residents are strongly opposed to any plan that contemplates basing nuclear weapons in the harbor of our Nation's most populous city, and this concern is far from frivolous. According to an unclassified General Accounting Office report, the Department of Defense has experienced a significant number of nuclear accidents and incidents in the past 20 years, and the threat of an accident at homeport sites is real.

New Yorkers are also concerned that the Navy has no plans to house needed homeport personnel, that it has overstated the economic benefits of the homeporting plan, and that it has ignored key environmental laws in preparing and executing the homeport plan. Concerned residents have fought a long and hard battle against the homeport which has included numerous legal efforts to block homeport construction. As the Representative of the constituents of the 17th District, I have cooperated with these ongoing efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment once again all my colleagues who have worked to create successful and non-partisan base closing legislation, and congratulate all the members of the Commission for bringing us their report. I hope that approval of the Commission's recommendations today will signal the beginning of a new era of responsible defense spending decisions.

□ 1440

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, there are no illusions about the outcome of today's vote.

The bases in question will be closed.

Before that happens, there are some points each Member of this body needs to be aware of before you vote, points that need to be made a part of the official record to serve as a benchmark for future reference.

Many see this as a classic conflict between parochial and national interests. It may look that way, but it isn't.

In fact, very little about this proposal is as it appears.

The longer it is examined, the less it resembles what we thought we were getting when the base closure process began last year.

We thought we were getting annual savings of \$3 to \$5 billion. Now we're told it will take 20 years—two decades—before all the annual savings stacked on top of each other will add up to our original expectations.

In consumer protection language, that is "bait and switch" at its worst. We wanted real savings; what we're getting is false economy.

Evidence mounts every day that any savings to be realized from this proposal have been greatly exaggerated while its costs have been understated.

By its own accounting, the Base Closure and Realignment Commission acknowledges that its plan could save less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual Defense budget.

On further investigation, even that amount overstates the case.

In the specific instance I am familiar with—that of Lexington Army Depot in my district—we have found that the data on which the Commission formed its judgment was in error by up to 200 percent.

Only last Friday, I was told by GAO investigators who had spent the past 2 weeks in Lexington that the Commission's payback projections for that installation appear to be wildly optimistic.

Instead of the 6 years the Commission said it would take before savings could be realized by closing Lexington Army Depot, GAO's preliminary estimate is that it will now take 11 and possibly up to 15 years.

Other Members familiar with other bases throughout the country have reported similar discrepancies.

What these and other investigators are finding is that there will be far more costs involved in closing these bases than the Commission allowed.

If you thought the Pentagon was the home office of cost overruns, wait until you get the revised bill for this exercise.

Already, the estimated startup costs have doubled.

And nobody at the Pentagon is talking about the largest cost of all: the cost of cleaning up the environmental problems that have been covered up over the years.

You've heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] express his concern about a multibillion dollar problem at the depot in his district.

In Lexington, the original environmental cost estimate was \$6 million.

Now, that has been multiplied all the way from 3 to 10 times the initial estimate.

That's just the bad news; it gets worse; and read my lips on this:

I am telling you that there is no money to pay the enormous environmental cleanup costs at these bases.

So, what happens next?

Six, eight years from now, there will be new faces in Washington.

A new Secretary of Defense.

A new Secretary of the Army.

New Under Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, and their staffs.

And these new people are going to take one quick look at this mess and say, "I didn't make any of these promises, I wasn't around then, it's a local problem."

So, the point is this:

Today's vote isn't only about savings, it's also about expenditures.

And it is these expenditures that raise the very real possibility that Congress could be voting today to create abandoned toxic waste sites throughout the country.

As I said a moment ago, the issue before us is not what it seems and is certainly not what we had in mind when the Commission was created last year.

The base closure plan is of questionable parentage born prematurely and deposited on the doorstep of Congress like the illegitimate child it is.

But today, this House will adopt it.

The question is:

Will we follow through and be good parents?

Or will we abandon the child when the cost of carrying out that responsibility starts to hit home?

There has to be a better way, and the first step toward the real savings we need to make in defense spending can begin today by disapproving the plan before us.

We can slow down this mindless process, get answers to the questions that we've raised, sort out the glaring mistakes that have been made, close those bases we all clearly know should be closed, and avoid the environmental and economic nightmares that are such an obvious part of the ill-conceived and tainted package we are asked to judge today. And at the very least, wait for the General Accounting Office to present its figures.

□ 1450

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has 19 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has 36 minutes remaining.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today as one of the Members whose district is directly affected by the Base Closing Act. The Fort Wingate Army Depot in Gallup, NM, is 1 of 145 domestic military installations recommended for closure or reduction in size by the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I want

to take this opportunity to clarify my position on this issue.

I strongly oppose the closing of Fort Wingate because I believe the Gallup facility serves an important Army function and the base employees do a good job. Fort Wingate ships, receives, renovates and stores ammunition, and components and is responsible for the disposition of unserviceable ammunition. The base is strategically located on a major transportation route from the west coast to the Rhode Island Arsenal. It is also in the vicinity of the Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories, and Kirtland Air Force Base. Furthermore, the employees of Fort Wingate have always served proudly and kept operations at the base running smoothly. Fort Wingate has served this country well and I believe it deserves to continue operating.

I want to do everything I can to save the Fort Wingate base and help its employees. I cannot, however, single Fort Wingate out of the entire base closing package. The base closing Commission's recommendations cannot be amended, only the entire package can be opposed. The base closing package as a whole is beneficial to both New Mexico and the entire Nation.

New Mexico stands to benefit a great deal from the base closing package. Kirtland would gain the Air Force Inspection and Safety Center from the closing of the Norton Air Force Base in California. This would bring Albuquerque an additional 346 military personnel and 138 civilian jobs. Cannon Air Force Base would gain 1,102 military personnel and 57 civilian positions as the F-111 tactical fighter squadrons are moved from the Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho.

Passage of the base closing package is an important step in our efforts to reduce the country's budget deficit. A strong vote in favor of the Commission's recommendations would also signify that politics will not prevent us from reaching our budget reduction goals. The Commission estimates that the base closing package will save this country \$693.6 million annually. It is important that we unite behind this issue and support the Commission's recommendations.

For these reasons, I will vote against House Joint Resolution 165, a resolution to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I will, however, devote my energies to make sure that the transition of Fort Wingate will be as smooth and equitable as possible for the employees and the Gallup community. First of all, I want to make the Fort Wingate facility into a National Guard unit so that all the employees can keep their jobs. Discussions toward this end are already underway. Should this fail, I want to

make sure that all the employees will be well taken care of through job placement programs, homeowners assistance programs, and economic adjustment assistance. I have already undertaken discussions with the Department of Defense to make Fort Wingate into a National Guard facility. They will be coming to Gallup, NM, this spring to speak about this possible transition. I commend the Department of Defense for their help in this painful transition. I will also work with the Gallup community to develop strategies and coordinate action plans to generate new job opportunities and social benefits as we convert the Fort Wingate facilities.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have listened carefully to the opponents of this resolution. The opponents who would have us close these bases pursuant to the recommendations that have been made by the Commission. I listened carefully because I wanted to be able to pick out carefully what the objections were to our resolution which would disapprove the list. They have been consistent and there has been just one objection to our motion to disapprove the list, and that is that there is a belief among the the proponents of the closure list, to quote one of the previous speakers, "There is no greater need today than the need to reduce spending." I could not agree more.

I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are in support of today's resolution could not agree more, either, but let me tell all of my colleagues, this resolution which would disapprove this list does not go against cutting spending, because this list simply does not save money.

I spoke for a while the other day here on the same subject in the same debate and I pointed out why. Those Members who were here or listened, listened to those arguments, but let me repeat them very briefly. The Commission has grossly underestimated the costs of realignment. This chart which I showed Members the other day shows that the Commission estimated in terms of the cost in blue for closing several bases. Then DOD was asked what it would cost to close the same base and they gave an estimate, and that estimate is represented in red. It might be called red ink, because in the case of my base at Fort Dix in New Jersey that we have all talked about and we all know about, and I think all Members of the House recognize that it should be on the list. In the case of the base in New Jersey, the Commission recommended that it would cost \$245 million to realign the base. That we all, at this point, know

it should not be on the list. When DOD was asked for their estimate, it estimated \$372 million, the red ink. It is not just Fort Dix, it is George Air Force Base, it is Norton Air Force Base, it is the Presidio, it is Chanute, it is Mather, and we could have listed probably two dozen others. So cost estimates are underestimated.

Second, they have overestimated savings. I would not go into a great detail, but at Fort Dix alone, the General Accounting Office says they overestimated savings by \$20 million. Third, the Army Audit Agency did a study of the TRADOC bases where basic training was done. They were asked to do that by the Secretary of the Army to determine how basic training could be done more efficiently and at less cost. They recommended that savings could be made by closing down facilities at Fort Knox, not the whole base, and Fort Leonard Wood, and using existing space that exists at Fort Jackson and at Fort Dix. As a matter of fact, let me read the final paragraph in that audit report. "Recruits should be scheduled for basic training at installations where adequate barrack space is available to avoid additional barracks constructions or barracks modernization costs." And, "Based on the fiscal year 1989 through fiscal year 1993 training program, all recruits and trainees attending basic training, advanced individual training, can be housed in adequate barracks if the training workload is decreased at Fort Knox and Fort Leonard Wood and increased at the six remaining centers."

"Additional basic training companies could be established at Fort Jackson and Fort Dix where there is 10,763 excess barracks spaces." But instead, the Commission recommends that we spend \$245 million to build new facilities at Fort Knox and Fort Leonard Wood.

Finally, fourth, there has been a great deal of talk about military value. When we could not understand why certain bases were placed on the list, the Commission informed the Members begrudgingly, without detail, that those bases were placed on the list because they had a low military value, arrived at through a formula of computations based on facts gathered from those bases.

With regard to Fort Dix, specifically was my main concern, I was told that eight bases were ranked in terms of their military value, No. 1 through No. 8.

□ 1500

Fort Dix ended up next to last in terms of military value until the GAO did its report, and the GAO said, and I will quote from their preliminary report, "We have reviewed two categories of bases, Army training centers

and Air Force technical training bases, to test the Commission's phase 1 process with regard to military value. We found that the analysis of Army training centers, which includes Fort Dix, erroneous data were used. These errors affected the relative ranking of bases. Had accurate data been used, Fort Dix would have been ranked first of the eight bases in the category rather than seventh."

So, Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues that in terms of savings that I do not believe they are there. In terms of expenditures, I believe they are underestimated. In terms of the audit, Army Audit Agency's report says, "Don't build more bases. Just use the surplus bases we've got at Fort Jackson and Fort Dix."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the discussion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] here, but it seems to me we ought to inject a little light into this process.

However, Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman say to the House that after the GAO analyzed the material that was used by this Commission that they found that Fort Dix should not be rated as No. 8 in terms of training facilities, but No. 1?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is correct. It should not be rated as No. 8; it should be rated as No. 1.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] seriously saying that this Commission miscalculated data that would have them be that far off?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, this appeared in the GAO testimony that was delivered at 9:30 in the morning at the other House on April 12.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite imagine that. I mean what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is suggesting is that this Commission, first of all, was created because we in the Congress were not willing to do the job we were elected to do in the first place; we transferred our responsibility to bite the tough bullets to a commission, and then apparently they incompetently handled it at that level; their responsibility?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. To finish, Mr. Chairman, given what we know about the Commission's gross errors with regard

to the raw data, gross errors in terms of military logic and just plain commonsense, I refuse to believe that there is one Member of this House that would vote to put Fort Dix on this list.

Mr. Chairman, let us face it. We created a commission as part of a good-faith effort to obtain some genuine savings, but this blue ribbon Commission, this blue ribbon panel whose efforts simply were not worthy, simply were not worthy of that blue ribbon.

The bottom line is that they did an extremely poor job.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER], has 27 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 20½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, this House finds it is in a very uncomfortable posture today. We did it to ourselves. First we tried to evade the tough decisions and questions of what bases ought to be closed. Now we do not like the result, so we are trying to get back into the process.

I believe this is an unhappy end to an unfortunate procedure. The intensity of this debate proves once again that we might be able to run, but we are never really able to hide. We may be able to postpone the inevitable, but at a high cost both in terms of dollars and public support.

Our debate today is a profile of congressional cowardice. It is yet another unsuccessful effort by Congress to evade its responsibility to government. I think it is a monument to our appetite for government by autopilot and a reminder that such efforts usually fail. They succeed only in bringing this institution into disrepute.

Mr. Chairman, when we come up with these mechanical procedures to avoid making tough decisions, it makes our constituents back home wonder why we came to Washington. They elected us to make the decisions in their behalf, not to come up with clever devices that allow us to duck tough decisions. If we really cannot stand the heat, we ought to really get out of the legislative kitchen.

Further, today's debate is another proof that such schemes simply do not work. Whether it is Gramm-Rudman, or the Quadrennial Commission on Pay Raises or the Base Closing Commission we are talking about today,

the tough decisions ultimately return to us and get dumped right back in our laps.

The one such commission that succeeded was the 1983 Greenspan Panel on Social Security reform that did little more than provide cover for what a bipartisan coalition of thoughtful Congressmen wanted to do right from the start. We tried to duplicate that performance with the National Economic Commission. The NEC tried, but ultimately quit acknowledging that it was powerless to convince others to face the hard facts. Again the result is simply a delayed decision and wasted time and money.

Mr. Chairman, I am ready for the strenuous debate with my colleagues about which military bases should be closed. I am willing to argue that the cuts suggested for Illinois are wrong, and I am able to accept the decision of this House, whatever it may be. I am equally prepared for a similar discussion about tough choices that must be made to bring our budget deficit under control. I remind my colleagues that that is the broader issue that today's debate is really all about, but I do not have the patience to go through this exercise of evasion again.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat disgusted with government by commission. Our institution is demeaned by it. It is our job to decide what is worth the expenditure of Federal funds. I think it is time that we started doing our job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165. Our subcommittee spent considerable time over the course of the last 2 years trying to fashion a piece of legislation initially and all through the process at the urging of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to come up with a means of addressing the issue of base closure and realignments in a way that could not be attacked as being political. To that extent I think we were successful.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a no vote on the resolution which would do away totally with the recommendations of the Base Closure Commission. To be sure, and my colleagues have heard a number of comments here today that there were some mistakes made without question. In some instances decisions in part at least were made on erroneous information. But the decision before the House is whether or not, notwithstanding those errors, we are going to do away with the complete work product of the Commission, and I do not think that would be appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a number of budgets come to us this

year, and we are going to have another defense budget come to us probably next week. Those numbers are going to be very difficult to meet. Military construction, personnel and, yes, procurement are going to take big, big cuts.

□ 1510

There is a disappointment on the part of all of us that the recommendations of the Base Commission did not come up with more savings than they alleged they did, but at this point we have no other choice but to do away completely with the recommendations of the Commission or to accept them in total. For that reason, I urge a no vote on House Joint Resolution 165 and the membership ought to be advised to keep in mind and think about it before the vote, because if you are in favor of the base closure recommendations by the Commission, you should vote no on final passage.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Matsui].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding this time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the resolution before us, a resolution which would disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment.

The Commission's report, presented to the Secretary of Defense last December 29, recommended closing Mather Air Force Base, located in my district in Sacramento, CA. Despite that recommendation, I have come to the conclusion that the findings of this Commission are, in the aggregate, in this country's best interests.

I have made this judgment knowing full well that there are errors in the Commission's report. Let me cite two examples. In the case of Mather AFB, the Commission did not include in its calculations the maintenance function for the airplanes used by the navigator training school. The Commission itself has acknowledged this error, which accounts for roughly \$10 million of Mather's annual budget.

The Commission also estimated the military construction requirements for relocating Mather's missions to Beale AFB, but neglected to include an accounting of the requirements for relocating several of the missions to neighboring McClellan AFB. It has been estimated that these one time costs may approach \$40 million.

After meeting with Air Force officials, as well as officials of the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment, I have concluded that the closure of Mather AFB will save Federal tax dollars. Whether or not the exact level of annual savings estimated by the Commission will be realized re-

mains to be seen. In fact, the General Accounting Office has determined that the cost model may have underestimated the savings associated with closing Air Force bases. Nevertheless, what I believe the Commission has demonstrated is that savings can be realized, and that efficiencies within our base structure can be identified.

Let us make no mistake about it. The process of analyzing each of the bases operated by the Department of Defense as a candidate for closure is a monumental task. Each one of us who has a base in their district on the closure list has spent a great deal of time critically examining the Commission's recommendations. We have put our bases under a microscope, and each of us came up with a laundry list of concerns. Each base on the list presents a unique set of questions and issues associated with the closure. The Commission had the unenviable task of sifting through each base, looking for bases that could yield savings.

Some have suggested that there are two conflicting ways to analyze the Commission's recommendations. One way is to try to validate the data that the Commission used, to analyze the cost model, and to appraise the overall framework that was used to determine which military facilities should be closed or realigned. The second way is to step back and simply examine whether the Commission acted in a responsible and straightforward manner.

I do not think that there is a conflict between these two methods of judging whether these recommendations are in our best interests.

I have carefully gone over the data used by the Commission when they considered Mather AFB. I have looked closely at the cost model, and examined the larger framework that was used to develop the list of facilities to be closed. I have also looked for, but did not find, evidence that the Commission acted improperly, or in a fashion that violated their charter or the base closure law passed by Congress.

We knew when we approved this base closing process that it was an all-or-nothing deal. In approving this process, Congress acknowledged the difficult nature of closing military bases. But we resolved to create a process whereby an independent commission could, on a nonpartisan basis, make base closure recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Congress. We resolved to give this difficult process a chance to work.

We are being asked today whether we agree with the results. Most assuredly, a number of our colleagues will answer with a resounding "no."

Some will argue that, for one reason or another, their base did not deserve to be included on the list. I cannot come before you and say that every single facility on the list has equal jus-

tification for closure. The Commission's job was to determine whether there was compelling justification to close each base. Now it is our turn. Is there, on balance, sufficient justification to close all of the bases recommended by the Commission? I believe the answer to that question is "yes." I think it is in this Nation's best interests to allow this base closing process to move forward.

The closure of Mather AFB is not a new issue for Sacramento. Two years ago, the Air Force announced its intention to study Mather for possible closure. At the time, I fought the Air Force proposal because the methodology behind the announcement was flawed. Quite frankly, Mather was singled out by the Department of Defense to demonstrate an interest in base closures. At that time, the Air Force could not provide any rationale for studying the base for closure. We prevented the Air Force from closing Mather AFB in 1987 because it was an arbitrary action.

The closure of Mather AFB will present a significant change in the lives of many people who live on or near the base. This transition in the Rancho Cordova community and the entire Sacramento area will be a difficult one. Businesses have thrived due to Mather's presence in the community, and the closures we are contemplating here today will drastically alter the way of life for thousands of people in my district, and countless more across the country.

The time has come to plan for the future. Following the announcement of the Commission's recommendations, I created a special commission in Sacramento to coordinate and develop a reuse plan. This commission is composed of experts in military issues, local business officials, and community leaders. Their job will not be an easy one. Planning the future use of almost 6,000 acres amid a host of sometimes conflicting interests will require a heightened spirit of cooperation. The planning process will require a commitment to our common goal of putting together a planning document that will allow the Rancho Cordova community and the Sacramento area to grow and prosper from this closure.

The time has come to look to the future. The closure of Mather AFB presents several problems for the Sacramento community. There are over 43,000 military retirees in the Sacramento area, many of which depend on the hospital facility at the base for their medical care. Simply closing the hospital, thereby forcing each retiree and their eligible dependents to participate in CHAMPUS, will cause a dramatic increase in CHAMPUS costs, and will pose a greater financial burden on individual retirees. Abandoning the hospital is simply unac-

ceptable. We cannot walk away from this issue. We have a commitment to these retired military personnel, and we cannot violate that trust.

The time has come to protect our future. The Air Force has found ground water contamination at Mather, and is currently preparing a study to define the extent of the contamination and to develop a plan to clean up the base. As we all know, cleaning up ground water contamination is a difficult and time consuming process. I am committed to ensuring that the Department of Defense cleans up toxic contamination at Mather AFB. We must not and we cannot allow these communities who are losing a military installation to be further hampered by the lingering hazards of toxic wastes left behind by the Defense Department. We must have a commitment from the Defense Department, and we must have a commitment from the Congress to remove these contaminants from our bases.

Mr. Chairman, I will support the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment, despite the fact that Mather AFB in my district will be closed. After a painstaking review of these recommendations, I believe that the base closure process will, in the long run, result in a more efficient and cost-effective use of our military base structure.

In view of the time constraints on Commission members and certainly in view of the enormity of the issue, it was very difficult for them to make a decision that everybody would agree with.

I would say, however, in opposing the resolution, I do have some concerns. I appeared before the committee of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and talked with other members of the Armed Services Committee as well. The two concerns I have, one deals, of course, with toxic wastes, which I believe every Member has raised when they have expressed concern about this particular resolution. It will not be known at Mather Air Force Base until the spring of 1990 the extent of the damage by way of the toxic problem. I am just hopeful and I am relying upon the good faith of the Air Force that in fact that issue will be addressed before the land and property is transferred to private sources.

Second, of course, we have 43,000 military retirees in Sacramento County. Many of those retirees are there because of the inducement of Mather Air Force Base being located in Sacramento County. It is my hope that we are going to be able to solve the issue of health care facilities for these retirees.

Obviously, if Mather should close, that would in fact impact the health care of these people and I am relying

upon the good faith of the Air Force to deal with that issue as well.

Knowing these concerns, I still support the recommendations of the Commission and certainly believe that the committee has done an excellent job in analyzing this matter.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, we find ourselves at a fascinating point in our 101st session of the Congress. We meet today to discuss a thing called base closing. In the name of saving taxpayers' dollars and protecting the world at large, a commission is proposing to us a series of recommendations that purportedly will make a significant difference in terms of both our national defense and our national deficit.

Mr. Chairman, if this process were not so painful to my district and the county that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I represent, it would almost be a laughable suggestion that is before us.

Indeed, I am here to suggest to you that this is a classic demonstration to the American public of just how incapable the Congress is of handling the most fundamental of our responsibilities. Our people elect us every 2 years to come to the Nation's Capital, to sit on the floor of the House, to sit within our committee chambers, to listen to debate regarding the pro and con issues affecting our taxpaying public.

The Commission process is almost a classic illustration of our own admission that the Congress has totally failed in its ability to carry out those responsibilities. In the name of proving that Congress has the courage to make the hard decisions of deficit reduction, we stand before the American people with a commission report which is really about creating a massive new military construction program for the 1990's. Having improperly delegated the authority given to us by the taxpayers of this country, many Members see few alternatives but to accept the Commission's recommendations. Such a conclusion is not supported by the facts.

When we began Members believed that the Commission's work could save from \$3 billion to \$5 billion annually a year by closing down these bases. That number has been progressively cut back to the point where even the Commission's estimate of \$693.6 million in annual savings is admittedly lacking in credibility. We have gone from multi-billion estimates of real savings to the point where the chairwoman of the Military Installations Subcommittee can only say, "The bottom line is that it saves money."

It is suggested by some of my colleagues that we may even lose money by the process that we are going through here.

To illustrate that point in very simple fashion, I cite the case of Norton Air Force Base, which is a strategic airlift facility recommended for closure by the Commission.

□ 1520

We will really achieve annual savings of \$67.9 million within 6 years by moving it 9 air-miles away to March Air Force Base? If so, this Congress will have to find new funds for expedited environmental cleanup. Norton is on the Superfund list. While the Commission is willing to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to move a base 9 air-miles, the EPA is insisting that the same base must be cleaned to the best standards available before it can fall into private use. Strangely, there are no new moneys for this costly expedited cleanup.

Mr. Chairman, the general who is most familiar with this subject tells me that we could tear all the buildings down at Norton, rebuild them as brandnew facilities, and spend about half as much as we will by realigning the Norton mission to March AFB. That general further suggests that in a very short time the Norton airlift wings transferred to March Air Force Base will so overwhelm the SAC responsibility there that they will have to move on to some other base and probably cause more expenditure at a new location.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the point about Norton Air Force Base, which is of deep concern to me also. I concur with the analysis that he has just made, and it is my hope that even if we cannot succeed in preventing the closure of this base that we could certainly have an impact on the quality of the analysis that is being made in connection with this whole base-closing operation.

If it turns out that we have gone through this exercise and we do not actually save the money that was projected, we may reduce military readiness or security in some ways, then the best we can hope for is that we do not make the same mistake twice.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that the gentleman from California who just spoke represents Norton Air Force Base; that is, Norton Air Force Base is specifically within his district, not within

mine, but many of the employees from that base live and spend their taxpayers' dollars in my district. It is very apparent that the community where this base is actually located has one of the greatest unemployment problems in the entire State of California. Their most stable base of employment over the years has been Norton Air Force Base, and as we are facing the challenge of establishing an economic base that is sound in that community, the Federal Government is about ready to pull the plug. In the name of cost savings in defense, we will have to increase other Government expenses for such needs as unemployment and welfare. But that's what you get if the Congress decides to delegate decisions in order to prove it can be courageous when it comes to the national deficit.

Let me move on to another item that is suggested as an advantage of the commission process. It is suggested that this Commission in some way could evaluate the bases of the country and improve the mission and force structure of our armed services. George Air Force Base, a Tactical Air Command facility, in my district is the classic case for illustrating why the Base Closure Commission may have failed in its efforts to improve military value. The Commission would close George because of air traffic congestion and because of the distance between George and what the Commission notes is its single training and gunnery range.

Let me suggest on both counts that the Commission's analysis is almost ridiculous. First of all, there are mountain ranges on both sides of George Air Force Base. Those mountain ranges force the overflights of major airlines to be at about 20,000 feet as they approach Los Angeles Airport. There is no way that they interfere with those fighter aircraft that are taking off and landing at George Air Force Base. The F-4 flies in restricted airspace at altitudes below 10,000 feet. It is absolutely a ludicrous suggestion that there is some interference in that connection. That is why the Air Force is concluding an agreement with the FAA and the county of Los Angeles for a new 400-flight-a-day facility at Palmdale even as we find the Commission closing Air Force bases using a bogus standard: air traffic congestion in the Los Angeles to Las Vegas flight corridor.

Further, it is suggested that in some way the training process is improved by moving the George location to Mountain Home. Mountain Home is located in Idaho. Mountain Home currently uses George as its alternative flying facility for 4 months out of the year because of winter weather conditions. We can fly almost 365 days a year at George Air Force Base in perfect weather conditions, and yet this

transfer is being made to improve the Air Force mission.

George Air Force Base does not have just one range. George has access to six different gunnery and target range complexes—Superior Valley, Chocolate Mountain, Whiskey range, Leach Lake, and the Golf and Echo ranges.

This mix of highly sophisticated training arrays is not duplicated anywhere in the world. The replacement facility, Mountain Home AFB in Idaho, has one range which the Air Force rates as "marginal." If you really understand training missions, you know that avionics checks, visual lookout, and flight formations cannot be undertaken at a range which is only 22 air miles from Mountain Home. In other words, the Commission was ill-informed about the availability of ranges as well as the real role that distance plays in training pilots for sophisticated tactical fighter missions. Indeed, George AFB is the logical home for the next generation of American tactical fighters.

Today, this Congress will ratify the recommendations of a nonelected commission that met behind closed doors. It is not a mistake to revise our base structure. It is possible to save significant dollars by closing antiquated military installations. To do that, however, Congress must make the tough choices. Unfortunately, however well-intentioned the Commission was, its process was flawed by a dependence upon the very services whose goal was to protect what they had or at least to justify massive new military construction in the 1990's.

Mr. Chairman, we have questionable savings in this process. We have injured many a community. We may very well have violated the mission of the various branches of the military that are involved in the process. We can pound our chests, and suggest that we are even willing to cut spending insofar as the defense budget is concerned. But that is not what the commission process has given this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the patience of my colleagues.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closings.

When the authorizing legislation for this process was debated, I joined with a majority of my colleagues in this body to establish the Base Closing Commission. I did so because I viewed it as a realistic way to deal with the politically intractable problem of closing obsolete military installations, and also because we were led to believe that from \$2 to \$5 billion could be saved annually if obsolete facilities were closed and their operations con-

solidated. Indeed, I would be happy if I thought there would be any savings or the public interest would be otherwise served.

Only after the vote have we come to discover that these estimates were greatly inflated, and that the costs of closing the bases on the Commission's list were grossly underestimated. According to the Commission's own report, we should expect the base closing process to result in savings of no more than \$5.6 billion, spread over the next two decades. And, because of the flawed and inaccurate data relied on by the Commission, these savings are mostly illusory.

Let's face it—the closing of these facilities will entail much more than turning out the lights and locking the doors. The Commission reports that \$2.7 billion will be needed just for military construction costs associated with the closings. Add to that the environmental and cleanup costs, economic assistance to local communities, and other costs ignored by the Commission, and you arrive at a figure that could exceed \$4 billion. So where are the savings?

And where will the money come from to cover the costs of closing these facilities? With the Pentagon budget proceeding on a no-growth basis for the foreseeable future, other vital defense programs will have to be sacrificed to fund the base-closing plans. We surely cannot afford to be so penny wise and pound foolish when our national security is involved.

In my home State of New Jersey the closing of Fort Dix will mean the elimination of 12,000 jobs, and the certain prospect of economic upheaval for the region. The Commission estimates savings of \$84.5 million annually from shutting down Fort Dix, but the General Accounting Office could find only \$17 million in potential savings—and most of that amount is the result of cuts in personnel. The same holds true for many of the other bases on the Commission's list.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission's mandate from the Congress was to close obsolete bases, not to unnecessarily and without justification hand out pink slips to thousands of hard-working, taxpaying Americans without some significant gain for the public interest.

Politically, it would be the easy thing to go ahead and defeat this resolution, accept the Commission's recommendations, and try to convince the American people of the great strides we have made in cutting Government waste. But that would amount to little more than budgetary blue smoke and mirrors.

Agreeing to this resolution of disapproval, however, will not signal an end to identifying and cutting military waste. On the contrary, it will mean a

chance for a more detailed examination of our military facilities, including overseas installations, and hopefully a more accurate and cost-effective set of recommendations.

If we defeat this resolution and accept the Commission's recommendations, we may be washing our hands of the tough decisions temporarily. But we won't be able to escape for long the harsh consequences of our actions on the economy, on our military readiness, or on the lives of tens of thousands of working men and women.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

□ 1530

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise to ask my colleagues to follow the Commission's recommendations. I want to say, first of all, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] deserves a lot of credit.

I must say that we are only going to save projected in this bill about \$700 million, and I am not quite sure we are going to save the \$700 million. The tragedy is that we had a window of opportunity that would have permitted us to save or target somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$2.5 billion. The tragedy about this is that it will not be possible to come back in any relatively short period of time to close even more bases down that need to be closed because that window of opportunity is open for such a very short period of time. It is going to be difficult to come back and get that window open again because of political considerations.

I do not blame the Members who are here and talk about the difficulties they have with their bases. In fact, in some cases there may be even some justification, and there might even be some real facts to their arguments and not just hyperbole or emotional pleas. They may in some cases be exactly right. The difficulty, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], chairwoman of the committee, knows, and also the ranking Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], is that in the process of putting a formula together to allow us to close military bases down there was a strong effort made in the other body to skewer the formula to prevent as many bases closing as is possible.

So what may have happened in fact, ladies and gentleman, is that some bases that ought to be closed will not close because of the nature of the formula, and bases that will not yield the kinds of savings that we would like to see yielded are going to be the ones that are going to be closed. So because those opponents of the bill made a very strong effort to limit the impact of the base closing legislation, we are

not going to get the kinds of savings that we ought to get, and in fact I think it is very easy to make an argument that the dirtiest bases in the country, the ones that have the most pollution in this country, are the bases that are going to stay open because they are the most difficult ones to clean up and the ones that take the longest payback time.

So while we have some success with this Commission report, I must say that it is not as thorough and as complete as we would like. Rather than being able to save the \$2.5 billion, we may save only as much as \$700 million. The tragedy, of course, is that this Congress year in and year out keeps cutting the defense budget. We have a \$400 billion shortfall in some major weapons systems projected over the next 5 years, and yet we as a Congress, while we criticize the Pentagon and criticize everybody for an overbloated Pentagon budget, are unwilling to cut the waste from the areas where it ought to be cut so that we can have an effective and efficient military budget, something we all talk about and something the American people believe in.

I think it is a missed opportunity, but yet I guess in this body sometimes half a loaf is better than no loaf at all.

I do think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] deserves an awful lot of recognition, as does the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] who had a lot of hearings and tried to accommodate the concerns of Members, some of whom have had some real arguments, and unfortunately for them this formula was written in such a way that we are not going to get at the kinds of things we want to get at, and some of them are going to pay the price as a result.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from New York for yielding me time. I want to commend also my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for the eloquent statement that he made, which in effect summarized many of the major problems with the recommendations of the Base Closing Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I have made my case against the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I am confident that when the results of these closures are assessed years from now, many of the points I have made will be borne out. I rise today not to argue against the Commission's recommendations, but rather to remind my colleagues, and the Department of Defense, of a very important commitment which comes with this base closure package. This com-

mitment is that environmental contamination at the bases be fully cleaned up by the time the bases are closed.

While the base closing legislation did not explicitly require that environmental restoration work be completed by 1995, the Commission clearly operated on this assumption. The savings predicted by the Commission depend on the sale of the base property. If this property remains contaminated when the bases are closed, then the property cannot be sold, and the funding necessary to implement the base closures will have to come from other defense programs. Although the Armed Services have made it clear that they will clean up the bases, they have not committed themselves to doing so by the 1995 target date for the bases' closure.

There is another, much more important reason for cleaning up the bases. In order to offset the economic impact of the base closures, the affected communities must be able to acquire base property and convert it to job-producing civilian uses. Indeed, the affected communities have been told not to worry, because the civilian reuse of bases will restore the jobs lost from the base's closure.

This rosy scenario sounds great, but it will not happen unless Congress and the Pentagon make available the necessary funding for base cleanup. The General Accounting Office estimates that it will cost over \$800 million to clean up the 86 bases recommended for closure. Cleaning up the rest of our Nation's military bases will cost nearly \$20 billion. It is unclear where this money will come from. Implementing the base closures will cost nearly \$3 billion, and the administration has requested only \$1 billion for the base closure account.

Mr. Chairman, this base closing package has wide support, and it is no mystery how this vote will come out today. The majority in the House has jumped aboard the base closing bandwagon, and most are enjoying the ride. I just wonder how many will be on board when it comes time to pay for the cleanup of these bases. I am encouraged by recent indications that the Air Force will live up to its commitment to clean up the bases slated for closure. With regard to Norton AFB in my district, an interagency agreement between the Air Force and EPA is expected soon, and the Air Force has provided me with a schedule showing that the cleanup would be largely completed by 1995. I will be watching closely to ensure that this schedule is met. I can tell you one thing for sure: I will not remain silent if the Air Force tries to leave my district without spending the money to clean up the base it's leaving behind. I will not allow my community to be left

twisting in the wind so that the Members of this body can congratulate themselves for closing obsolete military bases.

A vote today in favor of closing military bases is not a vote that can be walked away from. It is a vote committing the Congress, in addition to the executive branch, to a process that will take place over the next 5 years, a process that will require ongoing support from the Members of this institution. The commitment from Congress to cleaning up these military bases must be as great as has been the commitment to closing these bases. It's a package deal that we are paying for today, and there will be downpayments to be made for years to come. I do not plan on letting anyone forget the obligation implied by their vote against the resolution of disapproval.

□ 1540

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left between the three sides here?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, parents often ask their children what they have learned each day when they come home from school. I suppose if my daughters were to ask me what I learned in Congress today about this base closure report, I would tell them that Congress, by commission, is a failure. It is true many of the military bases slated for closure should be shut down but also that many obsolete foreign bases, never considered by the commission, should likewise be shut down.

But we now know from the testimony received both here and in the body that some of these bases should never have been included in the Commission's base closure recommendation.

They are costly mistakes both in terms of national security and our defense dollars. Much of this is not the fault of the Commission. The mandate they were given was flawed from its inception, overblown in its beginning and in its expectations.

The Commission was told to save between \$2 billion and \$5 billion. But the Commission found early on that that mission was absolutely impossible.

In its own report the Commission estimated that its recommendation should lead to an annual savings of about \$694 million. But, my colleagues, you should realize that this estimated savings rests entirely upon

defense policy changes, defense policy changes, not in closing and in realigning bases.

It is important to note that most of the savings are hinged upon reductions of personnel. In fact, the GAO study shows that 84 percent of the estimated savings of this Commission report is in the reduction of personnel. At the same time for the Air Force they are expecting a surge in students by 1994 of almost 20,000 new students and they will need to expand their facilities and their personnel, not reduce them.

The whole tone of the Commission, as you reread that report, is one of manipulation of data, changing the ratings, fudging the dollar figures, misleading both Congress and the public.

In Illinois, for example, the Commission said that, "We have an empty military base, Chanute." That base is not empty. This Congress has appropriated \$150 million in the last 8 years to expand facilities and housing and improve facilities at Chanute. It is not empty.

Yet the Commission thought it was empty, an empty base. It has been rated, as Mr. MADIGAN pointed out, highest in its category in more than 44 different ratings. Yet it is on the proposed closure list. Even the Commission admitted that it was "right on the margin in cost savings."

If you review the transcripts and the GAO's preliminary report, they repeatedly show us that the expected "big savings" on the Commission's list will end up costing taxpayers money. And when this shell game of moving around is all over, the administration and Members of this body who support the Commission's closure and their recommendations will not allow, they will not allow the reductions in personnel that are needed to make this savings take place. So that no savings will be achieved and in fact we are going to be adding to the defense budget by rebuilding the transfer and receiving bases with new facilities for all the functions that are going to be changed and added.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the Members to vote in favor of this resolution of disapproval because now or later we have to exercise as a Congress our right, our responsibility to govern, to correct errors made by this Commission.

Errors were made. Congress has to be alert to those errors, and correct those errors. We will either today or we will correct those in the future.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do at this particular juncture is certainly congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for the work that he has done and the inspiration in honestly trying to make sure that our Defense Department and our Nation's security are run on as few dollars as we possibly can.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, JIM SAXTON, who has fought long and hard and I think has carried the water with regard to an important basic training base in New Jersey, Fort Dix. I think that Congressman SAXTON has clearly shown beyond any reasonable doubt that important and egregious errors were made when it comes to the analysis of Fort Dix, whether it should be considered for realignment, as in fact it has. And I would say, after examining the record, as I have over the past number of weeks and months, I think that the conclusion that I and many Members will have to come to is that although the Base Closing Commission's job in general was commendable, they worked diligently and hard, in a few instances they made irreversible error.

One of those instances is Fort Dix, NJ.

One of our north Jersey papers, not one that prints or mails or has a circulation near the south Jersey area in which Fort Dix is located, is the Record of Bergen. I think their comments in an editorial of April 18, entitled "Unbelievable Error on Dix," is an appropriate editorial. They say:

It's hard to believe that a commission, studying a subject as sensitive as the closing of military bases would be sloppy enough to make an error that could jeopardize its findings. But that's exactly what happened with the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. A clerk transposed a couple of figures, and the commission failed to notice that the Army had not provided updated information. The result: New Jersey's members of Congress now have a solid reason for opposing the commission's recommendation that Fort Dix be scaled down to semi-active status.

The errors were discovered by the General Accounting Office, the congressional watchdog agency. While the base-closing commission officially went out of existence after filing its report last December, a staff member last week said he would not challenge the GAO findings.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old country and western song saying that, "If you hang them all you get the guilty. If you hang them all you cannot miss. If you hang them all you get the guilty, there has been a lot of problems solved like this."

Mr. Chairman, that is not our system of jurisprudence in the United States. That is not the system of the burden of proof and justice on the floor of the U.S. Congress. Fort Dix is innocent. JIM SAXTON pointed out, and it was read last week and read again

today, that the GAO report indicated that had Fort Dix been looked at with proper data, with real information, not misinformation, with the proper information given without clerical error, Fort Dix on the important criterion of military value, Mr. Chairman, would have been ranked not seventh but first.

I would argue and I would clearly hold that if that information was properly given without clerical error, without mistake to those good people sitting on that Commission, Fort Dix would not be a topic of debate today, Fort Dix would look forward for another 50 years of carrying out well the basic training function in south Jersey.

Not only was there a clear egregious error, fatal flaws in the Commission's conclusion based on fatal flaws in the information they received, but also the GAO came to other conclusions as well. The GAO also found that the Commission's cost savings were in error and that the cost payback was not during the timeframe that was required under the legislation in the first instance.

Second, the annual savings are 22-percent less than the Commission stated.

Third, the personnel costs of maintaining Fort Dix in semiactive status has, according to the GAO, not been examined by the Army itself.

I might also add that when the two Chairmen of the Commission testified before the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Chairman, they indicated that they were not privy to a most important document prepared by the Army's Audit Agency, June 1988.

□ 1550

That audit said that the U.S. Army's basic training activities at Fort Dix should not be reduced but increased. The audit was conducted and written by the Department of the Army's Audit Agency and it recommends that report, that audit recommended that basic training be expanded and not reduced. Expanded for the sole purpose of saving money. This is the responsibility of the Audit Agency. The Audit Agency is not there to waste money, spend money, find new missions, expand patrols. It is there to save money, taxpayers' money. The Army Audit Agency said if Members want to save money, transfer basic training functions from other forts such as Knox and Leonard Wood to Fort Dix.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as we have heard time and time again, the Commission itself admitted the fact that about 80 percent of their savings came about by reducing the number of people that serve in our armed services. That was not their charge, that was not their mandate. They were under our mandate supposed to come

up with all their savings, within a certain timeframe, and leave the decision as to whether fort levels should be increased, remain the same or reduced, to the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Defense Department, and they did not do that. Their cost savings came about in a hollow way by saying they had to eliminate approximately 20,000 individuals from the Department of Defense.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that because of that tragic flaw, because the committee by their own admission did not take valuable information in hand, rank Fort Dix almost last when it should have been ranked first in military value, I stand here urging my colleagues to think about how they would feel if Dix were in their towns, if Fort Dix were in their congressional districts, or Dix were inside their State. They would be standing here arguing for justice. They would be standing here arguing that this Commission's report is fatally flawed and must be rejected.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the resolution of disapproval we are considering today and I urge my colleagues to reject it as well. We have the opportunity, after prolonged and painstaking work, to close or realign a number of obsolete military bases in this country and the time has come for us to do it.

Despite the objections of some of my colleagues to the closure or realignment of the recommended military installations, the fact remains that the recommendations made by the Secretary's Commission on Base Closure and Realignment will save the Federal Government a very significant amount of money. Actually, the amount, over a 20-year period is estimated by the Secretary's Commission to be \$5.6 billion.

The administration rejects this measure for exactly the reason I do. We should reject this resolution because we should lay aside parochial concerns and do what is best for the fiscal well-being of the country. Of course, this principle should be applied across the board to all money wasted on pet programs funded with taxpayer dollars. Today, we have an opportunity to cut a form of wasteful spending. In cutting these installations we also have the opportunity to actually enhance our national defense posture. Both Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee reported this measure unfavorably, in part, because failure to enact the recommended closure and realignment of these military installations will hurt rather than help our military strength by weighing down our forces with unneeded excess. If we want a leaner, more effective military with resources channeled to programs and systems that will actually make our military posture stronger, and with a greater capacity to meet the challenges confronting

our security interests, then this measure before us should be rejected. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution for the good of the country fiscally and militarily.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], who should have the last word on the subject from our side.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military forces is the President of the United States. In order to comply with his responsibilities under that designation, the President of the United States has the Department of Defense, and the Department of Defense is charged with supervising our branches of the military for the defense of this Nation. In order to achieve those objectives of maintaining a secure America, the Commander in Chief and his Department of Defense must be able to deal with the technologic and the geographic changes in the threat to our Nation.

Historically, that has meant the Department of Defense and the Commander in Chief must define the nature and the types of weapons systems, the nature and types of the personnel needed, and the basing of these military men and materials to maximize the efficiency of our defense operations. By and large this process has continued until after World War II. After World War II the technology defense began to increase and accelerate. The changes were enormous and massively threatening to all nations of the world.

The geographics of the threat to our Nation's defense also changed, and it became necessary to make decisions in the deployment of our men and materials.

Now what we have seen happening after World War II is the emergence of the Congress in this process, not because the Congress is charged with the responsibility of deploying and basing men and materials, but because Members of Congress cherish bases in their district. They began the process of obstructing the movement of the men and materials and the rebasing of our military defense services. This became a fine art and craft. The felony was compounded by administrations, I grant you. Congress has had in the past a real concern, reality base and valid concerns about administrations using the threat of base closures as a coercive element in the process of getting this or that vote.

By 1977 these two combined elements of Members of Congress to protect their turf and administrations unhappily politicizing the basing decisions had results in passage of legislation that made it impossible to close military bases. The last major military installation closed in America was 1977. There have been efforts to close

□ 1600

bases in this country since then, including, in fact, Fort Dix, by the Army on more than one occasion that have been frustrated by congressional intervention.

A couple years ago, some Members said there must be a way to resolve this dilemma, and we worked together and we came up with legislation that made it possible to close these bases and remove the congressional obstructions to these base closings. Initial legislation was marked up by three separate committees of the House, was debated at length on the floor of this House and was passed by a vote of 370 to 31. We all agreed it was not a matter of the Members of Congress' responsibility to second guess a professional and politically objective process. The results of that process were announced on December 29 and there were Members all over the country that were upset, communities were upset. This was anticipated. The Members of this Congress that represented those affected communities have clearly expressed their opposition by way of second guessing that professionally and politically objective Commission's report.

But the fact of the matter is the Secretary of Defense, Frank Carlucci, enforced and accepted that work. The current Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, has enforced and accepted that work, and most importantly, in terms of responsible congressional reputations, the Committee on Armed Services, that committee charged with overseeing the defense needs of our country, endorsed the work by a vote of 43 to 4. The fact of the matter is this work has passed the test.

This objective nonpolitical work has passed the test, been validated by the responsible parties. I would suggest to Members of this body if they want to complete the job that we did of breaking a 12-year impasse that crippled our Nation's defense capability, in its ability to respond to changing world threat, that we vote no today and let this decision go forward. I know it is painful for the community involved, but the bottom line is, defense directors are for defense needs, not for community development.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for the purpose of a discourse with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding me this time.

I wonder if the gentleman, first I would like to say it is most noteworthy that the gentleman from Texas so broadly endorsed selective hearings on the work. As Members listen to the testimony, is it in your mind conceivable that there is maybe even one base that may be on this list for closing that is a miscalculation?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, it is in my mind conceivable. Let me remind the gentleman that all three of the committees that had jurisdiction over this legislation insisted that we have an all-or-nothing package.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, is it the gentleman's presumption that if the Commission is in error on one base or the other, maybe that can be corrected in the appropriations process? Is that the gentleman's conclusion?

Mr. ARMEY. No. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is not my presumption. The deal we passed in such uniform agreement in this Congress was that we would take an all-or-nothing proposition. Neither the former Defense Secretary nor the current Defense Secretary nor the Armed Services Committee found a critical error in this list of recommendations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. So regardless of whether there is error on the Commission's part, whether there are bases for closing on the list that should not be closed, the gentleman says that we should accept the report regardless of that? Is that what the gentleman has said?

Mr. ARMEY. Unhappily, that is the option.

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is what the gentleman said, then; am I correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Unhappily, that is the option we were left with by agreement with this Congress a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself our remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to House Resolution 165, a measure to reject the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. We have had ample time to review and evaluate the Commission's report, and I feel that its findings and suggestions are both sound and timely.

In the course of our consideration of this resolution, Mr. Chairman, we must remember—and honor—the responsible and reasonable commitment Congress made last summer to establish this Commission and to authorize a thorough and comprehensive review of our domestic military installations.

We sent a clear and unequivocal message last July, that while a strong national defense is critical to our Nation's well-being, we must strive to invest our tax dollars prudently in this area. We recognized that certain facilities had become obsolete and that specific functions were being unnecessarily duplicated.

And while each of us hoped at the time that the Commission would not target a depot or a base in our district for closure or manpower reduction, we agreed collectively to submit to a diagnosis on the state of our domestic military operations. Furthermore, we adopted the position that the findings would be all or nothing, that we would judge the report as a single package rather than seeking to delete specific line items at the impetus of our colleagues.

From a purely parochial and political standpoint, the Commission's recommendations have prompted some of us to declare victory—where bases will be expanded and jobs created—and have led others to pledge to fight against the suggestion that their installations should be reduced or closed entirely.

I submit, however, that the issue before us is not whether or not, in the short run, we can return to our districts and report that we will gain or lose jobs as a result of the Commission's findings. Rather, we should conclude that this era of fiscal restraint compels us to tighten our belts, and to make every effort to cut spending in our defense budget where we will not sacrifice the strength of our national defense.

In addition, this difficult but indeed mandatory review of our domestic military installations should be conducted also for our bases overseas, where we reportedly devote in excess of \$35 billion each year. In fact, I intend to introduce legislation in the near future to establish a commission to investigate and to report to Congress which bases overseas should be closed or reduced in size.

More personally, I feel especially proud that my district in northeastern Pennsylvania includes the Tobyhanna Army Depot. Since its inception in 1953, the Tobyhanna facility has provided state-of-the-art communications and electronics services for our military. In fact, Tobyhanna is one of only a select few depots nationwide that is responsible for the maintenance, overhaul repair, and fabrication of communications and electronics.

With its talented and devoted work force of over 3,800 military and civilian personnel, Tobyhanna supports our Nation's defense satellite and radar systems and our surveillance and radio activities. I am delighted that the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure has recognized the valuable and indispensable services that Tobyhanna provides and pleased that over 430 new positions will be created if the Commission's recommendations move forward after today's vote.

I urge my colleagues to reject the resolution so that we may give the green light to the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure's recommendations.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the Members to vote no on this disapproval resolution that we have before us. It is painful to rise and ask that Members vote no because very many of my friends have testified in front of my subcommittee and made very, very eloquent pleas for their bases in their areas, telling us of the pain that their areas are going to feel by the closing of those bases. So it is not a happy task.

Let me make it very clear to members of the committee that the subcommittee spent hours and hours on this testimony. We did have the GAO come in and get more figures and facts for us. We did insist that the Commission release its figures and facts so that we would understand finally what was going on. They had been stonewalling Members whose bases have been closed, and we did get that changed.

Let me address some of the issues that were discussed here. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], whose resolution this is, made a very, very eloquent and profound statement about his environmental concerns, and he is absolutely right to be concerned. His concern is that they are going to close bases and then not allocate the money to clean them up. And he is right. Let us hope that that does not happen. The one thing I want to tell him is that if I am chairman of this subcommittee, we are going to do everything we can to make sure the DOD does everything they can do to clean them up. But I think one of the other motivating factors to the DOD is that they want to generate money from the whole event, and, therefore, they would not be able to sell these things unless they were cleaned up. So I think the DOD will be more inspired to clean them up than they normally would because they will want to get funds back into the till to be able to turn them into something else. Hopefully, they will see an investment, and cleanup funds will come out that way. But if that does not happen, I want to assure the gentleman from California that we heard his plea, and we are very sympathetic because we know that California has been mistreated before.

I also want to answer some of the comments of Members about the GAO. They are right in what they say. GAO came in and they found all sorts of incidents where the Commission could have come out the other way, and that there were some errors made one way or the other. But the bottom line in the GAO report was, putting all these errors aside, that we still save money if we vote no. That is a very important bottom line. Maybe we do not save as much money on some of the bases, maybe they disagreed with the models used on some of the bases, but they never said on one of these bases that it was going to cost money to close them if you look at over a 6-year period.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just echo the comments of the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and reinforce her comments. I

would like to say that I commend the gentlewoman and her subcommittee for the review she has done of this base closing work being accomplished by the Commission.

Again let me say that I think the gentlewoman's conclusion is absolutely right. We set up this procedure, and we set up a process. The process worked its will. It did a job which outside observers said was a fair job, a competent job, a perfectly reasonable job, and they came up with a list of bases to close. I think it is incumbent upon the rest of us now, having examined the issue, having looked at it, having had a chance for all the people who objected to having their bases closed, and having listened to their case, to say that this is a good job and we ought to complete the job, finish what we have done here and vote down this resolution of disapproval. I think that is a very, very important job.

Let me also say that from that point on it is incumbent upon all of us to make sure that this base closing list gets implemented, that we not have any end runs in the appropriations process, that we not have any language stuck in some continuing resolution somewhere. I just want everybody to go on notice that all of us, including the gentlewoman who is the chairman of the Milcon Subcommittee, and the chairman of the committee, should make sure that there is no fooling around with this list, and that we are going to be watching all legislation from now on to make sure that there is no end-running of this list, because we cannot end-run this list and make an exception in the appropriations process for one base without unraveling the whole package and making a case for other Members to make a base exception, because then pretty quickly we will be right back where we started from.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Colorado, and commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for his sponsorship of the legislation. I would also like to commend the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carlucci, as the person who picked up the idea and instituted it as an initiative from the administration. I think that this was a job well done, and I think, therefore, what remains to be done is for the Congress to vote down this motion of disapproval and for us to keep our eyes on the continuing resolution and the appropriation bills to make sure that this thing goes through as advertised.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. I also want to thank the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], who has been tireless in lis-

tening and helping us as we go through this. He and I have been very concerned about all the issues I mentioned, plus the issue of the retired military that the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN] talked about. We certainly want to do everything we can to make sure we do not break our commitments to the retired military. The bottom line is that last year when the Congress voted on this, they had read George Bush's lips, and he said, "No new taxes," that we have got to find ways to cut money. The bottom line is that GAO said this is the way to cut money, no matter what. The bottom line is, once we voted this package through, there were only two reasons we could really derail it. We could find out that the Commission acted politically, which no one has found, or that they acted irresponsibly and whimsically, and they certainly have not.

No one has quarreled with their models. They just said that maybe they would quarrel with some of their numbers. But we still end up saving money. That is the real issue. So we decided to start down this road, and here we are, finding out whether or not we have enough guts to stay on the road.

I agree with many of the people who say that foreign bases should be included. We will be introducing a bill next week to look at foreign bases, too. A third of them are overseas. That is a great oversight, and we will be looking at that, I am sure. But that comes next. We should not use that as a "duck" on this. That saves money. This starts down the road. The gentleman from New York and I would like to assure our colleagues that we are going to take many of their concerns about the environment, about the retired military, and about all the other things they came up with. We really are going to take those things into account, but we want them to know that we need to save money at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would briefly underscore what the gentlewoman has said. We have heard much about the testimony of the General Accounting Office, and for the most part that has been accurately characterized. But let me just briefly paraphrase the ultimate statement from the General Accounting Office: "I need to emphasize that the issues I have discussed and the questions raised about the Commission's work are not intended at this point to imply disagreement with the Commission's overall conclusions."

□ 1610

With that, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for yielding, and I commend her for her work and leadership on the subcommittee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] said it very well. The bottom line is this saves money. The bottom line is people do not want to raise taxes, and they do not want to cut anywhere else, and I think we have to look at the hearing report that we have had, and that is the conclusion that we came to.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this body to vote no on this resolution to show that we are going to stay on the road that we said we were going to stay on.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for yielding.

The purpose for asking the gentleman to yield is to basically comment on the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] with regard to the GAO report when they said in their statement that there was real error does not necessarily mean that they disagree with the committee's recommendation. I think the way it was said, that implies that they agree, but it should not be read that way. The GAO did not have the time to second-guess the committee. All they are saying is that on a very crucial, important piece of information the Commission received the wrong information and that they cannot really go beyond that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. However, Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] knows that the Commission received its information from the services, and, if the services gave them the wrong information, they still acted in good faith. It is very important to point that out, and GAO still finds no matter what base they close, they save money over a 6-year period, and so, while I understand the gentleman feels very strongly about this, and I understand that, the other side of it is that they did not say that the Commission acted capriciously or politically and that there are still savings there to be found, and they just said that maybe some of the information from the services was not comprehensive enough.

Mr. Chairman, this is very important to remember and to put into context, and I urge a no vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165, legislation to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

Let me say that it's an easy matter to stand up and take credit for bringing jobs into the district. It's easy to hold a press conference announcing to your constituents some good news event. But it's another matter entirely to stand up in favor of a petition that may not be politically popular to support back home, even if it is good for the Nation as a whole.

The day the closure list was released, over 100 congressional staff waited nervously in line to receive their copy of the Commission's report. They entered the Armed Services Committee room with apprehension written all over their faces, and exited either smiling or ashen-faced.

The report contained recommendations affecting 145 installations: 86 for closure, 54 for realignment, and 5 others for partial closure. Fort Douglas, UT, was listed for closure. I supported the Commission's list, even though it included Fort Douglas, UT, which employs many of my constituents.

As I saw it, I had two choices. I could take the politically popular approach of fighting like a wildcat over the closure of Fort Douglas, or I could accept the fact that the Commission was probably correct in its recommendation. I took the latter. I decided to support what I honestly believed made good public policy and good sense, and then resolved to turn the closure into a positive for my constituents and my State.

When the Commission released its report, I immediately introduced legislation to transfer all of the excessed property of Fort Douglas to the University of Utah to be used for educational and research purposes. With the recent nationwide attention the university has received over the results of a fusion experiment conducted by Dr. B. Stanley Pons and a British colleague, Martin Fleischmann, I can think of no better way to use this land than to expand the fusion research capabilities of the university.

Mr. Chairman, maybe the recommendations of the Commission won't save \$5 billion as some have suggested. Maybe there will be some initial pain back home in some districts, but I believe we all stand to gain in the long run if Congress can accept the fact that obsolete military bases should close. Certainly, with my bill, Utah stands to gain.

We are very close. Very close to shutting down the first major military installation in 11 years. However, if we pass House Joint Resolution 165, we will never shut down a military base. It's now or never, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of disapproval.

I wish to commend the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure for its thorough work, and to thank its co-chairs, former Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut and former Congressman Jack Edwards of Alabama.

The Commission has rendered valuable assistance to Congress by making impartial rec-

ommendations, which are vital because base closings and relocations have such a potentially devastating impact on local economies.

Closing national defense facilities is always a difficult and onerous task. I'm sure the merits of each selection were difficult to weigh. The Commission made its selections based on determinations of cost and efficiency, for the purpose of eliminating waste and redundancy in our national security structure.

Today's debate must include not only the savings which will accrue to the Nation as a whole, but also the local impact of the base closings. Phaseout of defense facilities clearly poses difficulties for localities, which face job losses and the need to attract replacement industries and develop alternative uses for the closed facilities. It is our responsibility to assist with the economic revitalization of the affected areas. These are communities which have contributed generously to our Nation's defense.

Economic diversification is the key to the continuing economic health of any region, especially those which now face cutbacks in defense dollars. The process of national security decisionmaking must be responsive to local needs as well as to national security needs by providing economic alternatives to communities which face defense-related cutbacks.

In addition to the economic assistance provisions of the base closing bill, we must provide an ongoing means of economic diversification and revitalization, not only for the communities affected by these closings, but for the future.

At the request of the Speaker, Congressman WEISS, Congressman MAVROULES, and I have been drafting legislation to facilitate economic diversification and development of alternative use plans for defense facilities, in order to maintain economic health in the event of fluctuations in defense spending. The legislation will make aid available to communities with large defense contracts so that they can begin to diversify now, before future cutbacks cause political and economic anguish. Communities already affected by the base closings would also be eligible for additional economic adjustment assistance.

In southeast Connecticut we are proud to contribute to the naval strength of this Nation. Because we derive a large percentage of our livelihoods from defense dollars, we are sensitive to defense budget issues such as cuts and competition designed to produce savings for the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of economic diversification and revitalization for communities whose labor produces the tools for this Nation's defense. You will have an opportunity to support such legislation later in the session. For now, let us support the streamlining of our national security structure by voting down the motion of disapproval.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165: to disapprove the recommendations of the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

Last year, I voted against passage of the base closure law. I argued that the claimed savings were illusory—that the safeguards against potential abuse were weak—that the

law avoided the power and responsibility of this House. I stand by those arguments.

Instead of seeing savings of \$5 billion as some Members claimed, the Commission predicts a little over 10 percent of that number, and I remain skeptical. Furthermore, I believe Members have made legitimate arguments against recommended closure of many bases.

However, I do not believe that is sufficient reason to overturn the entire list. If Congress is to vote to overturn the list, the Commission's findings must be fundamentally flawed—top to bottom. I just do not believe that is true.

While I believe the base closure law may be a bad one, I do not believe the Commission's findings are so flawed that they must be scrapped.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165—a resolution to disapprove the Base Closing Commission's recommendations. I hope my colleagues join me in this "no" vote.

We have been down this road over and over again. For more than a decade, the Department of Defense has been stopped from realigning and closing unnecessary bases. The reason—legislative hurdles that have sprung up between Congress and the executive branch. Now there is virtually general agreement within the entire Government that national defense could be improved, and costs reduced through the use of fewer bases.

I served on the Grace Commission in 1982. Its recommendation: That a nonpartisan, independent commission be established to study the base closure issue. Well, finally here it is. We've come a long way. The legislation before us today follows the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. They were approved by Secretary of Defense Carlucci, and supported overwhelmingly by the House Armed Services Committee. Now it's our turn.

The Commission has done its homework. The recommendations reflect information received from experts in private industry, military services, and other parts of the Defense Department. The results reflect a broad independent judgment. Let's move on this issue and show we are serious about reducing the deficit and eliminating a major source of waste in the Federal Government.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165 which would reject the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closings and Realignments.

It has never been easy to close military bases that have outlived their usefulness. In fact, the Defense Department has been trying for years to close obsolete bases, some of which date back to the days of muskets and sabers. At every turn, the Defense Department has run into a congressional roadblock.

Last year, a breakthrough was finally achieved when Congress passed the Base Closure and Realignment Act, which I cosponsored. Our plan was that a bipartisan commission would identify obsolete military bases for closure or realignment. The impetus behind the commission approach was to achieve needed budgetary savings and streamline our defense structure without the taint of partisan

wrangling. In a show of support for the plan, the House of Representatives passed the final base closure legislation by an overwhelming margin of 370 to 31.

The Commission has executed a difficult task admirably and we in this body owe it to the American people to carry out the nonpartisan Commission's recommendations. Congress is charged with the duty of removing inefficiencies and waste in our Nation's defense structure. If Congress blocks the Commission's proposals, a clear message will be sent to the taxpayer that this body lacks the intestinal fortitude to reduce the deficit by eliminating wasteful spending.

Implementing the Commission's recommendations will still save \$694 million annually—a substantial amount by any yardstick. Some Members would have us believe that saving this amount will not make a difference in the budget deficit. Saving \$694 million annually will make a significant difference and by closing these bases now, we can prevent future pork barrel spending which would be necessary to upgrade or rehabilitate these bases if kept in active service.

Contrary to popular belief, a base closing does not spell certain economic disaster, but rather offers an opportunity for an economic boon to a community. Former military bases have been turned into industrial parks, municipal airports, colleges, and historical sites. In fact, Pease Air Force Base in New Hampshire will likely be converted into a commercial airport to help meet the increased demand from the Boston area. Such a conversion will generate new tax revenues and jobs for the local community.

With our budget deficit still out of control, the implementation of the Commission's proposals to close and realign obsolete military bases is a good way to achieve needed savings. It is a responsible step to eliminate waste in defense spending and trim budget deficits. Moreover, this plan will permit the Defense Department to reallocate funds to better support our men and women in uniform, who are manning the more critical bases needed for national security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to remember their responsibility to our Nation's taxpayers. We must reject this attempt to derail the Commission's plan to streamline our defense structure and achieve critical budgetary savings.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, last year the Congress passed the military base closing bill. By passing this bill, we agreed by an overwhelming vote of 370 to 31, to allow a commission to recommend bases for closure or realignment. Our goal by setting up such a commission, as you all know, was to strive for efficiencies in the Department of Defense that could help reduce the budget deficit. Now some Members of Congress want to disregard the Commission's findings. I believe that the Commission accomplished what it set out to do. Therefore, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165, and in support of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure's recommendations.

It's true that the savings from closing or realigning these bases will not be as great as the estimated \$2 billion to \$5 billion, but a savings of \$700 million a year, and \$5.6 billion

savings over 20 years, is still a savings, and I believe well worth the effort. Also, I hope the savings will stimulate us to revisit this potential savings area soon.

Some in the Congress have complained that the Commission's recommendations are flawed or the information they used is not accurate. Following five public hearings with expert witnesses, visits to 44 installations by Members and staff, and information from the Military Services and other elements of the Defense Department, the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure formulated their recommendations. I believe that the Commission, a highly qualified, nonpartisan group, executed the task assigned them with a great deal of care. My only regret is that more bases were not recommended for closure and the savings were not greater.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this occasion pass without a special tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Enactment of legislation is never a solo effort here, but without DICK ARMEY's wisdom, persistence, and ingenuity, there would have been no base closings and no savings. Congressman ARMEY has earned his own, and all of our, salaries by his brilliant work on this bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, back in October of last year, I supported the base realignment and closure bill, which represented a remarkable and overdue accomplishment by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. There is no question that some base closings are in order. Back in 1978, President Carter made recommendations for base closings. Ironically, Fort Sheridan was on President Carter's list. Owing to the level of functions at Fort Sheridan—which in the intervening years have been expanded—I requested of the Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, a cost-benefit study that would justify such action. As it developed, the Army could not demonstrate that the transfer of functions to Fort Benjamin Harrison in Indianapolis represented a cost savings that would justify the transfer. Thus, I was surprised to find that Fort Sheridan was again on the base closing list. But I assumed that the Commission had done its homework and that on an objective examination of the facts, Fort Sheridan legitimately belonged on the list.

Then, our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] showed me information from the declassified Commission transcripts. I was shocked to learn that the Commissioners had improperly included Fort Sheridan on the list despite the fact it failed the formula for closing. The Commission's only apparent reason for adding Fort Sheridan to the list was "because our gut said that it ought to be added." The truth of the matter is, the Commission was simply responding to media pressure rather than a study of the merits of their recommendation in this case. The lack of rationale for closing Fort Sheridan throws the entire Commission report in question. Mr. ARMEY's initial plan was developed to save the taxpayers money, not waste it. How many base closures were recommended based upon Commissioner's gut feelings?

It would appear the waste of taxpayers' money came out of paying for this study

which drew conclusions upon gut feelings rather than proper study as was anticipated by the sponsor of the bill. At least with regard to Fort Sheridan, the Commissioners betrayed the taxpayers, the military, and the Congress. For this reason, I must oppose the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure and urge my colleagues to do likewise. In fact, there is a case to be made for a congressional investigation into how the Commission spent the taxpayer dollars involved in preparing this flawed report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I support the substantial savings which can be achieved by following the recommendations of the independent Base Closing Commission. I was not a Member of Congress when that Commission was established, but I supported its mission. And now that its work is complete, I support the Commission's findings.

New Hampshire's only military base is on the final list. Pease Air Force Base, and 90 other military installations across the country are affected. These closings are essential to achieve a projected \$5.6 billion savings over the next 20 years.

Although this was a difficult decision for me, I believe in the long run, it is in the best interest of our State and our Nation for us to follow the Commission's recommendations. If we are realistically going to attack our huge budget debt the tough choices must be made. Through this action New Hampshire is making its contribution to cutting the deficit. I hope the rest of the Nation will follow. We are putting our money where our mouth is when it comes to cutting the budget.

Now I believe we must turn this action into an opportunity for New Hampshire. Let's create openings out of this base closing—plant openings, job openings, and open houses. With proper oversight and planning this valuable property near our sea coast can become a boon to our entire State.

My chief concern at this point, in addition to what happens to the land, is for the people. I want to be assured that the welfare of the civilian employees at the base is taken care of. I also am concerned that retired military personnel and their families continue to have convenient access to medical services, and PX supplies. We will continue to work for these things.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for House Joint Resolution 165, a bill to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

Let me say that all of us in Congress are deeply concerned about reducing the Federal deficit, and we all support the closing of obsolete military installations and taking all other steps to reduce and eliminate waste and duplication in the military. However, many facts which have been uncovered by my Illinois colleagues concerning the activities and determinations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure are most troublesome.

For years, Fort Sheridan has always been mentioned as being targeted for closure, and it has always been high on the list when anyone discussed the closing of bases. Yet by the criteria clearly established by the Commission, Fort Sheridan scored fourth among Army administrative headquarters installations. In

fact, this score was ahead of 10 other bases that were not selected for closure. Yet Fort Sheridan was selected. I have to ask my colleagues why Fort Sheridan was targeted by the Commission, and why the Commission ignored its own formula in this instance.

With regard to Chanute Air Force Base in Illinois, it is most disturbing to find out that not one member of the Commission ever visited this Air Force base and not one official at Chanute was ever contacted by the Commission. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that a General Accounting Office report stated that the information used by the Commission on Chanute was incorrect. Chanute is among the oldest of the installations and technical training centers in the Air Force, but over the last decade over \$170 million has been spent to modernize this facility. That the Commission chose to call Chanute "an empty air base" is inconceivable when Chanute continues to train and graduate about 24,000 students annually representing 25 allied countries. Over 50 courses taught at Chanute are not taught elsewhere, and Chanute continues to receive awards for excellence. Yet this base was also recommended for closure by the Commission.

There is absolutely no rational basis for closing these two facilities, yet both Chanute and Fort Sheridan are slated for closure. If these problems exist regarding the reasoning of the Commission when considering Illinois bases for closure, it is possible that the same problems exist in the Commission's conclusions on installations in other States it listed for closure and realignment.

Because the recommendations of the Commission are so badly flawed, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 165, disapproving these recommendations. Instead of dismantling our viable and productive military facilities, we should work toward achieving an objective and fair evaluation of these facilities so that we may truly work toward saving money, while at the same time improving and preserving useful and important bases in our defense system.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, which would disapprove the recommendations of the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

I approached the work of this Commission with considerable skepticism last year, and I voted against the legislation which authorized it for a number of reasons.

My own experience with past efforts by the Defense Department to close a major Air Force base in my district did not encourage me to look favorably on the task this Commission was given. Hasty, misguided, and misinformed attempts by the Pentagon to close down Loring Air Force Base in the late 1970's left me with considerable doubt that this Commission could fulfill its mandate to "take the politics out of base closings," by objectively taking into account the full range of military, economic, environmental, and community concerns unique to each base in the Commission's sweeping review of all of our Nation's domestic military facilities.

Certainly, I am satisfied that the Commission chose not to include Loring or other military facilities in Maine on its list of bases to

close and realign, despite relentless press speculation and misinformed public commentary that Loring would be a natural or inevitable candidate for the Commission's ax. Clearly, the Commission did its job in this respect, and concluded that on the basis of the extensive criteria in its character which the Commission was required to consider, Loring is a highly unsuitable base to close, with far too great a strategic value to our country to merit such premature extinction.

But the law which Congress passed to authorize the work of this Commission is an extraordinary and restrictive one. Changes, compromises or amendments to the Commission's report are not allowed, either by the executive branch or by the legislative branch. Both the administration and the Congress were required either to accept the entire list of changes or to reject it as a whole.

The Defense Secretary moved quickly to accept the report last January, but Congress is now faced with the unenviable task of holding one up or down vote on the entire proposal, while the legislative clock ticks and our opportunity to disapprove the report will soon expire.

It is for this reason that my original objections to the procedures used in this matter remain unchanged. I have grave doubts about the wisdom of Congress delegating its constitutional rights and its political powers to the executive branch and to unelected public commissions, merely because some issues are extremely sensitive politically and may present no easy or painless political options. We are elected to make those tough decisions, and to preserve the historically vital prerogatives of the legislative branch in our system of government.

The proponents of this extraordinary base closing exercise have asserted from the beginning that it is a one-time only endeavor, designed to make a valuable contribution at a time of special political transition, but that argument does not correct the more fundamental mistake of using such a special and sanitized process in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is impossible in fact to "take the politics out of base closings," however distinguished and balanced a commission of experts the Government may wish to appoint and to invest with the authority to do so. It is an inherently political issue, and should be dealt with by the political process our democratic system provides.

The need to reform the military infrastructure and to realize savings in the defense budget is a real and compelling one, but if Congress or the administration wish to close military bases, they should propose to do so with legislation that will face the same congressional scrutiny and debate that has so well served our country's overall interests for 200 years.

I will therefore support this legislation to disapprove the Commission's report, and I urge my colleagues to consider this vote carefully in light of the constitutional and procedural questions it poses.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 165, and in support of the base closure process.

We are going to hear from many Members today who have bases in their districts that the Commission erred in its selections, that its savings calculations were incorrect and in fact that the base closure process was flawed.

I respect Members' concerns and think we have an obligation to hear them out. In fact, the Armed Services Committee has already done a good bit of listening on this subject.

Most members of the committee acknowledge that the base closure process itself was not and by its very nature never could be 100 percent objective because it required choices. But we found that the Commission carried the process out in the most objective manner possible, and that it was fundamentally sound.

As you listen to the concerns of those opposed to the base closure process, keep in mind what forced us to adopt it. Specifically, most Members acknowledged that there are some military bases out there which no longer serve vital functions, and that there are others which could be made more efficient through realignment with others. Based on past experiences, we knew that if we wanted to eliminate or consolidate such bases, we would have to remove politics from the selection process. Adoption of the base closure process did that.

After reviewing the concerns we are hearing today, the Armed Services Committee recognized that this process is probably the closest we will come to making rational base closure choices. If we derail this process, we will probably have closed the door on any opportunity for closing existing military bases and achieving critical savings over the long term.

I respect the concerns of Members representing districts with bases targeted for closure. I represent a district adjacent to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard—a frequent candidate for closure on previous base closure lists. I, too, was concerned about the impact closure might have on the economy of the region and on the thousands of shipyard employees who reside in my district.

I have always believed that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard's mission and work record justified its existence. But I felt it was appropriate—actually, a good idea—to have an independent group review it and other military bases to make an objective determination about continued base viability. So I supported base closure fully prepared to accept its consequences. Obviously, I was pleased that the Commission agreed on the need for the Philadelphia Shipyard after its exhaustive review. But if it had not, I was prepared to search for other economic development alternatives for the region.

We can no longer afford to keep unnecessary military bases at the expense of other vital national needs. If we are serious about reducing defense spending, we can start here by putting petty politics aside. I hope other Members will support this view and show the American people that we are prepared to start making some difficult choices necessary for deficit reduction.

I want to commend former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci for his support of the base closure process, and ask his successor and our former colleague Richard Cheney for his continued efforts to see it through to completion.

Finally, I would add that approval of this base closure list is just a beginning step in the move toward a leaner and meaner national defense. It is one of the first coherent attempts to logically reduce spending. But we must continue looking for greater efficiencies in the Defense budget.

During consideration of the base closure bill last year, the House adopted my amendment directing the Commission to give priority consideration to closure or realignment of bases in which the local community has formally expressed an interest in such action. Although this directive was superseded by adoption of the ArmeY amendment, I hope that the Secretary will give it serious consideration. He has the power to overcome the resistance that sometimes exists within the military itself to closure of unnecessary installations, and I think it is just as critical that we seek out these opportunities as it is to push ahead with the closures which are being resisted externally. Continued attention to opportunities for greater efficiencies in our military system can only benefit American taxpayers.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the recommendations of the nonpartisan Commission on domestic military base closings, and I would urge my colleagues to remember the confidence we rightfully placed in the members of that Commission when this body overwhelmingly approved legislation establishing this process last year.

No one ever suggested that cutting obsolescence and waste from the Federal Government was going to be without some displeasure. Anticipation of that displeasure is one of the reasons Congress has avoided the issue for so many years. Last year, we decided to place that issue before an independent commission, and the legislation we passed contained certain safeguards to prevent tampering with the closure list, or political intrigue from tainting the choices or the process.

At that time, no one suggested that this Commission, cochaired by our able former colleagues Senator Abraham Ribicoff and Representative Jack Edwards, was lacking judgment to make good decisions. Nor was it alleged that our former colleagues were incapable of analyzing the data—and challenging it, if need be.

If anything, I am disappointed that the Commission did not go further and recommend additional savings, which most of us realize are absolutely necessary if we are ever to get control of the Federal budget deficit. And for those who criticize the Commission's estimated savings, which are lower than we expected, how can we possibly justify to our constituents our indifference over \$700 million a year, or our failure to implement even this modest amount of deficit reduction?

When the House Armed Services Committee considered this resolution of disapproval, the result was a very lopsided 43-to-4 vote rejecting it. Evidence presented during the committee's hearings supports a conclusion that the Commission properly carried out its mandate and did not err significantly in its conclusions.

I would hope our vote in the House would send a similarly strong signal so that that signal is heard by the American people—and by those who might attempt to thwart the

process to which we have agreed through the appropriations process. This shouldn't be the end of our efforts to conserve Federal resources. We should use the precedent of this effort to examine similar waste in our defense installations overseas.

Far from being antidefense, this exercise in efficiency is good for the military because it means we get more real defense for the buck. I urge my colleagues to remember the commitment we made last year, and vote against House Joint Resolution 165.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, last year I supported the base closing bill. In fact, I was a cosponsor of Representative ARMEY's original legislation. At the end of last year, the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment in its recommendations included a base in my district—Naval Station Puget Sound—to be realigned. Because of this, you might expect me today to support this resolution against the recommendations of the Commission. But today, Mr. Chairman, I continue to support the Commission's recommendations. I do so obviously not out of parochial interests, but in the national interest.

I do have reservations on how the Commission came up with the cost-savings figures for Naval Station Puget Sound. I cannot disagree, however, with the Commission that it makes sense, logistically, to move the parts of Naval Station Puget Sound which support the Everett Homeport to Everett.

But in considering this resolution, my decision was not determined by the effect on my district, though this was a factor. My decision was determined by the needs of the Nation. And the Nation needs and deserves a more efficient military. Obsolete and unnecessary bases should be closed and consolidated. When considering what bases to close or realign, the major factor must be the military value of the base. Military decisions, especially in this time of limited resources, must come above politics. The Commission was set up because of this and has rightly made military value its primary criteria in examining bases for closing and realignment.

This, Mr. Chairman, is why I support the Commission's recommendations and urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, last year Congress indicated to the American taxpayers it was responsible and willing to cut special interest and fat out of the Federal budget. On July 12, 1988, it passed the base closure measure with a resounding majority of Members in support. At that time, no one could deny the savings from closing obsolete bases. Politics were set aside for the sake of saving billions of dollars. Savings and a more efficient military establishment was the common goal.

Now we have a measure in front of us today to disapprove the recommendations of the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. If this measure is approved, American taxpayers can effectively say goodbye to the savings they supported.

The question before Congress is whether the Commission acted honestly and responsibly when preparing the data to base their decision. I believe they did.

The House Armed Services Committee approved the Commission's actions and conclusions. The methodology used by the Commission was sound, the data supplied by the services were accurate. Even the cost model showed minor mathematical errors that the General Accounting Office discovered—but such errors were insignificant.

Despite the argument that the savings are less than what was projected by the Grace Commission, the Base Closure Commission found the savings to still be exceptional—\$693.6 million annually or \$5.6 billion over 20 years.

We did it last year—we set aside parochial interests and allowed a commission to do the dirty work for us. They did and their conclusions are accepted by most. I remind my colleagues that no major base has been closed for over a decade—since 1977. This proves it is next to impossible to get a base closure through. If we should fail here, it could be many, many years to rectify the situation. Nobody wants waste in our defense budget and moreover, we can't afford waste in our defense budget. We have a measure in front of us that would deny savings this country desperately needs. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, today, I wish to express my support for the recommendations of the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

The Commission was chartered on May 3, 1988, to recommend military installations within the United States, its Commonwealths, territories, and possessions for realignment and closure. The Congress and President Reagan subsequently endorsed this approach through legislation that removed some of the previous impediments to successful base closure actions. The President signed this measure into law—Public Law 100-526—on October 24, 1988. I should remind my colleagues that the House passed the conference report on this legislation by a vote of 370 to 31.

As provided by Public Law 100-526, we are now considering a resolution to disapprove the recommendations of this 12-member bipartisan Commission. A vote for the resolution constitutes rejection of the Commission's recommendations; a vote against the resolution allows the Department of Defense to proceed to close and realign bases as recommended in the Commission's report, subject to appropriations.

After reviewing the Commission's report, the Armed Services Committee concluded that the Commission acted "honestly and responsibly." The committee recently overwhelmingly recommended against passage of this resolution.

While the estimated savings from the Commission's recommendations may not be as high as originally hoped for, the Commission estimates that \$693.6 million can be saved annually if the Department of Defense acts to close and realign the bases included in its report. If these recommendations are implemented, they would represent the first base closures in 15 years and would eliminate a major source of waste in the Federal Government. Further, our national defense will be improved and unneeded Federal land will be re-

stored and put to productive private or public use.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent a great deal of time crafting a nonpartisan, equitable process for closing and consolidating obsolete military bases. The process is working and the House and Senate should reject efforts to invalidate the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the passage of House Resolution 165, to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I fully support the work of the Commission, have faith in the accuracy of its findings, and applaud this rare exhibition of good sense by Congress to deal with a sensitive issue.

As most people know, I am a strong believer in responsible military reform. Thanks principally to a well-established record of opposition to wasteful and ineffective weapons systems such as the Sergeant York antiaircraft gun and the Aegis missile system, I have earned the title of "Cheap Hawk." Critics may have intended the comment in a derogatory manner, but I am proud to think that I have so distinguished myself. As a veteran of the Vietnam war and former Air Force pilot, I am firmly committed to ensuring that the U.S. Armed Forces remain strong and soundly able to carry out their constitutional duty to defend this country and their moral duty to defend the free world. At the same time, however, I believe we must recognize the limits to our resources and make a concerted effort to use what we have in the most effective manner possible.

Thus I support the Commission's efforts and oppose this resolution to disapprove its recommendations for the same reasons that I have occasionally found myself battling the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex. If America wants a strong military, she cannot fill her arsenals with guns that don't shoot, planes that don't fly and bombs that don't explode. I am not ashamed to be known as a "Cheap Hawk," and I challenge any Member of Congress to tell me why we should spend billions of dollars on weapons we don't need or that don't work.

Similarly, I have long advocated a reexamination of our military bases as a necessary step for military reform. As far back as the 98th Congress, I introduced the Military Real Property Disposal Act of 1982 to initiate the base closure process. I felt then—and still believe—that in times of mounting pressure on the Federal budget, we cannot as a nation afford to keep military bases operating for any reasons other than purely military ones. Given these budgetary constraints, I believe more than ever that we must spend taxpayers' dollars wisely: On weapons we need, on military facilities with the maximum amount of value, and on domestic programs which meet the legitimate needs of our population.

Some people who are unhappy with the results of the Commission have criticized the rationale behind its creation. And I agree that establishing a commission to decide which bases are needed and which are not is in some respects an abdication of responsibility by Congress. I certainly regret the fact that we are unable to sit down as a legislative body to make the tough choices that need to be

made. Congress' handling of the budget deficit is a perfect example of the inability on the part of a great many in this body to say "no" to anybody for anything.

Nevertheless, the business of government must continue. One way or another, we must cut the fat out of the budget, from both military and domestic spending, in order to reduce a deficit of truly scandalous proportions. In an attempt to do just that, the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure was created to carefully, thoughtfully, and objectively examine our Nation's military bases and to make a rational, apolitical judgment about them. The Commission has effectively accomplished the job it was intended to do. While I heartily sympathize with those communities losing a substantial source of income because of the closures, I do not sympathize with those wishing to overturn the results of this exhaustive review, which represents Congress' best effort to begin the process of facing up to fiscal reality.

For these reasons, I applaud the Commission's hard work and wish to go on record in support of its recommendations. Issues like these must be frankly and honestly faced—and overcome—if we are to begin to responsibly govern this Nation.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this resolution of disapproval of the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closures and Realignments. I have thought over this question carefully. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, I am aware of the administration's fiscal year 1990 funding request for the base closure account. That request is for \$500 million.

As the representative of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, which includes Fort Bliss, I have looked at the Commission's recommendations from a second angle. I am not convinced that the proposed relocation of the Basic Combat Training mission component from Fort Bliss to Fort Jackson, SC, makes sense either in terms of cost savings or in terms of readiness. Fort Bliss is a mobilization post, and it appears to make good sense to have a basic training function at an installation where you want to call up the reserves and remote units in the event of a conflict. I have also heard and read about realignments and outright closures at a number of other installations around the country where the cost savings to U.S. taxpayers are far from evident and where the economies of local communities are certainly going to be damaged.

The difficulty lies in the bill we enacted last year. We made the package indivisible. The Congress prejudiced itself from being able to pick and choose among the recommendations once the report was submitted. I would have liked to have included overseas bases among those open to the Commission's recommendations. I would have preferred that the Commission had had more time and resources available to it—and I would have wished that the Commission had been able to testify before the Congress during its deliberations on issues such as force modernization. The point to consider in reference to the Resolution on the floor today is that we did not provide for these kinds of oversight in last year's

bill—and we did not provide for them because of the demonstrated near-impossibility of passing a bill subject to being broken out and cannibalized in the future.

A substantial amount of evidence regarding realigned force structure, the regional medical needs of the active duty and retired military populations and community dependence on military installations has already been gathered during the 3½ months since Secretary Carlucci submitted the Commission's report. That evidence should be weighed in the context of whether or not the Congress wants to implement the findings as they have been referred to us. The question of implementation lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. We should be prepared to look at it there—and we should look at the report in the context of whether or not it does what the Congress originally intended it to do—achieve real and lasting budgetary savings. Like all the other legislation we will be considering this year, the first test ought to be the impact on the deficit. In my view, this is still an open question where base closure is concerned. But we cannot at this time cavalierly pretend that the question is moot—and that is what a yes vote here amounts to. I urge that you vote down this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, last year I supported the base closing bill. In fact, I was a cosponsor of Representative ARMEY's original legislation. At the end of last year, the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment in its recommendations included a base in my district—Naval Station Puget Sound—to be realigned. Because of this, you might expect me today to support this resolution against the recommendations of the Commission. But today, Mr. Chairman, I continue to support the Commission's recommendations. I do so obviously not out of parochial interests, but in the national interest.

I do have reservations on how the Commission came up with the cost savings figures for Naval Station Puget Sound. I cannot disagree, however, with the Commission that it makes sense, logistically, to move the parts of Naval Station Puget Sound which support the Everett Homeport to Everett.

But in considering this resolution, my decision was not determined by the effect on my district, though this was a factor. My decision was determined by the needs of the Nation. And the Nation needs and deserves a more efficient military. Obsolete and unnecessary bases should be closed and consolidated. When considering what bases to close or realign, the major factor must be the military value of the base. Military decisions, especially in this time of limited resources, must come above politics. The Commission was set up because of this and has rightly made military value its primary criteria in examining bases for closing and realignment.

This, Mr. Chairman, is why I support the Commission's recommendations and urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100-526, the Committee now rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

BROWN of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. BRUCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution, (H.J. Res. 165) disapproving the recommendations of the Committee on Base Realignment and Closure, pursuant to Public Law 100-526, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the statute, the question is on the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 43, nays 381, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—43

Annuizio	Hamilton	Pelosi
Bentley	Hastert	Perkins
Boxer	Hayes (LA)	Porter
Brooks	Hopkins	Rinaldo
Brown (CA)	Hughes	Roe
Bruce	Hyde	Rostenkowski
Campbell (CO)	Kennedy	Roukema
Costello	Kolbe	Roybal
Courter	Lewis (CA)	Sangmeister
Crane	Lipinski	Savage
Donnelly	Madigan	Saxton
Durbin	Martinez	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McCloskey	Snowe
Florio	Michel	
Gallo	Pallone	

NAYS—381

Ackerman	Burton	Dorgan (ND)
Akaka	Bustamante	Dornan (CA)
Alexander	Byron	Douglas
Anderson	Callahan	Downey
Andrews	Campbell (CA)	Dreier
Anthony	Cardin	Duncan
Applegate	Carper	Dwyer
Archer	Carr	Dymally
Arme	Chapman	Dyson
Aspin	Clarke	Early
Atkins	Clay	Eckart
AuCoin	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Baker	Clinger	Edwards (OK)
Ballenger	Coble	Emerson
Barnard	Coelho	Engel
Bartlett	Coleman (MO)	English
Barton	Coleman (TX)	Erdreich
Bateman	Collins	Espy
Bates	Combest	Fascell
Beilenson	Conte	Fawell
Bennett	Conyers	Fazio
Bereuter	Cooper	Feighan
Berman	Coughlin	Felds
Bevill	Cox	Fish
Bilbray	Coyne	Flake
Bilirakis	Craig	Flippo
Bliley	Crockett	Foglietta
Boehrlert	Dannemeyer	Foley
Boggs	Darden	Ford (MI)
Bonior	de la Garza	Ford (TN)
Borski	DeFazio	Frank
Bosco	DeLay	Frenzel
Brennan	Dellums	Frost
Broomfield	Derrick	Gallegly
Browder	DeWine	Garcia
Brown (CO)	Dickinson	Gaydos
Bryant	Dicks	Gejdenson
Buechner	Dingell	Gekas
Bunning	Dixon	Gephardt

Gibbons	Matsul	Scheuer
Gillmor	Mavroules	Schiff
Gilman	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Gingrich	McCandless	Schuetz
Glickman	McCollum	Schulze
Gonzalez	McCrery	Schumer
Goodling	McCurdy	Sensenbrenner
Gordon	McDade	Sharp
Goss	McDermott	Shaw
Gradison	McEwen	Shays
Grandy	McGrath	Shumway
Grant	McHugh	Shuster
Gray	McMillan (NC)	Sikorski
Green	McMillan (MD)	Sisisky
Guarini	McNulty	Skaggs
Gunderson	Meyers	Skeen
Hall (OH)	Mfume	Skelton
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Slaterry
Hammerschmidt	Miller (OH)	Slaughter (NY)
Hancock	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (VA)
Hansen	Mineta	Smith (FL)
Harris	Moakley	Smith (IA)
Hatcher	Mollinari	Smith (MS)
Hawkins	Mollohan	Smith (NE)
Hayes (IL)	Montgomery	Smith (TX)
Hefley	Moody	Smith (VT)
Hefner	Moorhead	Smith, Denny
Henry	Morella	(OR)
Herger	Morrison (CT)	Smith, Robert
Hertel	Morrison (WA)	(NH)
Hill	Mrazek	Smith, Robert
Hoagland	Murphy	(OR)
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Solarz
Holloway	Myers	Solomon
Horton	Nagle	Spence
Houghton	Natcher	Spratt
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Staggers
Hubbard	Neal (NC)	Stallings
Huckaby	Nelson	Stangeland
Hunter	Nielson	Stark
Hutto	Nowak	Stearns
Inhofe	Oakar	Stenholm
Ireland	Oberstar	Stokes
Jacobs	Obey	Studds
James	Olin	Stump
Jenkins	Ortiz	Sundquist
Johnson (CT)	Owens (NY)	Swift
Johnson (SD)	Owens (UT)	Synar
Johnston	Oxley	Tallon
Jones (GA)	Packard	Tanner
Jones (NC)	Panetta	Tauke
Jontz	Parker	Tauzin
Kanjorski	Parris	Thomas (CA)
Kaptur	Pashayan	Thomas (GA)
Kasich	Patterson	Torres
Kastenmeier	Paxon	Torricelli
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Towns
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Traffant
Kleczka	Pease	Traxler
Kostmayer	Penny	Udall
Kyl	Petri	Unsoeld
LaFalce	Pickett	Upton
Lagomarsino	Pickle	Valentine
Lancaster	Poshard	Vander Jagt
Lantos	Price	Vento
Leach (IA)	Pursell	Visclosky
Leath (TX)	Rahall	Volkmer
Lehman (CA)	Rangel	Vucanovich
Lehman (FL)	Ravenel	Walgren
Leland	Ray	Walker
Lent	Regula	Walsh
Levin (MI)	Rhodes	Watkins
Levine (CA)	Richardson	Waxman
Lewis (FL)	Ridge	Weber
Lewis (GA)	Ritter	Weiss
Lightfoot	Roberts	Weldon
Livingston	Robinson	Wheat
Lloyd	Rogers	Whitten
Long	Rohrabacher	Williams
Lowery (CA)	Rose	Wilson
Lowey (NY)	Roth	Wise
Lukens, Thomas	Rowland (CT)	Wolf
Lukens, Donald	Rowland (GA)	Wolpe
Machtley	Russo	Wyden
Manton	Sabo	Wylie
Markey	Saiki	Yates
Marlenee	Sarpaluis	Yatron
Martin (IL)	Sawyer	Young (AK)
Martin (NY)	Schaefer	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Boucher	Kolter	Quillen
Chandler	Laughlin	Schneider
Davis	Pepper	Whittaker

□ 1633

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, STENHOLM, and DORNAN of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SNOWE changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 165, the joint resolution previously rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House from Tuesday, April 18, 1989, until Tuesday, April 25, 1989, and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate from Wednesday, April 19, or Thursday, April 20, or Friday, April 21, or Saturday, April 22, 1989, until Monday, May 1, 1989.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader of the program for the next week, the next month.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Republican leader yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, I believe, when the House adjourns tonight, it will adjourn under an adjournment resolution which will take us to Tuesday, April 25, at noon. The House will not be in session tomorrow, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, or

Monday. We will be in session at noon, Tuesday, April 25.

There are five bills scheduled under suspension of the rules: H.R. 840, the Federal Maritime Commission authorization, fiscal 1990; H.R. 1223, the NOAA Marine Fisheries Program authorization, fiscal 1990-92; H.R. 1224, the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, fiscal 1990-92; H.R. 1225, Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act authorization, fiscal 1990-92; and H.R. 1763, the Panama Canal authorization, fiscal 1990.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 26, and Thursday, April 27, the House will meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday and 11 a.m. on Thursday to consider, subject to a rule, an unnumbered H.R., the emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1989, and H.R. 1486, the Maritime Administration authorization for fiscal 1990, subject to a rule, and House Resolution 87, to impeach Judge Walter L. Nixon of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

On Friday, April 28, the House will not be in session.

Members should be advised that on Tuesday, April 25, the House again will meet at noon. We will consider five bills on suspension of the rules. Recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until after debate on all suspensions, but will be immediately taken thereafter. I will repeat, we will postpone votes on the suspensions debated on Tuesday until all suspensions have been debated, but any votes ordered will be immediately taken. Members would have to recognize the possibility that votes might occur very early in the afternoon. That is a possibility. I just cannot predict that there will be no undertaking to remove the votes to any particular hour of the day.

Because we are going into a relatively long period without session, I make that statement advisedly.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the distinguished majority leader, noting that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is on the floor and may be in the mood to make a request for a late filing, could I anticipate that kind of move and inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee whether that is in accord with the feeling of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this is for midnight filing, may I say, just permission to file by midnight tonight.

Mr. MICHEL. Would the distinguished chairman tell me, because I do not see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] on the floor, is that agreeable with him?

Mr. WHITTEN. I understood that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] was going to reserve all points of order.

Mr. MICHEL. We do not quite have agreement on that, and I wanted to make absolutely sure before the request was made that we clear up any problem there for the gentleman.

□ 1640

That is the only question I wanted to pose.

I would then ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] if there is to be a rule granted would we be taking up that supplemental on Wednesday or on Thursday?

Mr. FOLEY. We take it up at the request of the chairman of the committee, and I assume that would be on Wednesday.

Mr. MICHEL. My point being, and the reason for my question being that if we are not here Monday and we will not have votes until late Tuesday, boy, it is going to be tough to get a corporal's guard to testify on the rule on the supplemental if we have a problem.

Mr. FOLEY. I would just again, if the gentleman will yield, remind the House that the debate on these suspensions can be relatively short, and it is not at all clear that votes on the suspensions would not occur until late in the afternoon. They might occur at 2 o'clock in the afternoon as the beginning of those votes, or theoretically even earlier. So we are not urging Members to delay their arrival in the House. Members should be here from the time the House convenes at noon.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman, and we will make a decision on the other request.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday April 25, 1989, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Brown of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY APRIL 26, 1989

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednes-

day rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 26, 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND ELECTION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION AND RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND ELECTION AS MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Washington, DC, April 18, 1989.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.,
The Speaker, Office of the Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that I hereby resign my membership from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 18, 1989.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.,
The Speaker, Office of the Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that I hereby resign my membership from the Joint Committee on Printing.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. WALSH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer two privileged resolutions (H. Res. 131 and H. Res. 132), and ask for their immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first resolution.

The Clerk read House Resolution 131, as follows:

H. RES. 131

Resolved, That Representative Grant of Florida be and is hereby elected to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the second resolution.

The Clerk read House Resolution 132, as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Gingrich, Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1493

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1493, the Children's Health Protection Act of 1989. My name was placed on this bill inadvertently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 125

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 125. It was placed there in error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, earlier we voted to uphold the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I supported the Commission's recommendations based on the intent of this legislation.

The intent of base closure was to allow the Federal Government to realize needed savings in our military expenditures. Estimated savings are expected to be \$694 million a year.

The bipartisan backing this report has received shows the strong intent of Congress to cut unneeded spending, something which I heartily support.

REVISED DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-49)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, April 18, 1989.)

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, FISCAL YEAR 1987—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, April 18, 1989.)

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe certain requirements with respect to the labeling of food products. The Food Labeling and Heart Disease Reduction Act of 1989 would direct that food labels be required to list the following information:

First, the percentage of calories from fat per serving.

Second, the total amount of fat per serving and the amounts which are saturated, polyunsaturated, and monounsaturated.

Third, the amount of sodium per serving.

Fourth, the amount of dietary cholesterol per serving.

There is also a component in this bill that calls upon the FDA to present this data in a format that would enable consumers to utilize the information in a manner that is significant in the context of a daily diet.

This additional information would give consumers an opportunity to select food products based on information that has been cited in studies and findings by Government, consumer organizations and industry as important factors in a healthy diet.

Currently, unless the food producer or manufacturer chooses to do so, the label that is required by FDA for certain foods does not contain any specific requirement for breakdown of fat content, or any requirement for dietary cholesterol reporting. Yet, these two factors in the diet are recognized in two major scientific reports, the Surgeon General's Report on Nutrition and Health and the National Research Council report: Diet and Health: Implications for Reducing Chronic Disease Risk, as a significant dietary link in the incidence of major chronic diseases afflicting our population, particularly heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 cause of death.

Although sodium content is required on FDA labels, it is included in this legislation to ensure that it remains part of any new labeling legislation. The link of sodium to hypertension and stroke is well documented and is recognized as a health factor. In a 1988 survey by the Food Marketing Institute, over half the consumers surveyed reported that they checked the sodium content of items frequently—as opposed to occasionally, rarely, or never.

Interest in American consumers for this specific information has grown significantly in the past 6 years. The Food Marketing Institute also surveyed shoppers asking "What is it about the nutritional content of what you eat that concerns you and your family?" Of the 27 choices—ranging from calories, fiber content, chemical additives, fat content et cetera—the three selected most often were fat content, salt/sodium content, and cholesterol levels. Certainly indicating that Americans are more aware of the importance of diet in overall health and adjusting their eating habits accordingly. However, current labeling requirements lack the necessary information for the consumer to make decisions on foods with regard to these important nutritional items.

My reason for selecting these four criteria in this new label focuses on heart disease, the Nation's leading killer. In 1987, heart disease was the cause of over 750,000 deaths in this Nation. This number accounts for over one-third of all deaths—including cancer and all accidents. More than half a million of these deaths were from coronary heart disease [CHD]. Over 1.25 million people—two-thirds of whom are men—suffered from heart attacks. In addition to the obvious tragedy of loss of a loved one, the cost to our society is enormous. In 1985, the cost for lost productivity and

direct health care expenditures due to illness and deaths from coronary heart disease was an estimated, staggering \$49 billion. We cannot afford such losses, either in dollars or loss of human life.

While the causes of coronary heart disease [CHD] are multifactorial, including a genetic link, there are generally accepted factors that can lessen the risks. According to the Surgeon General's Report on Nutrition and Health and the National Academy of Sciences' report Diet and Health: Implications for Reducing Chronic Disease Risk, there are three major modifiable risk factors for CHD: 1. High blood cholesterol, 2. High blood pressure, and 3. Cigarette smoking.

According to both these major studies—as well as numerous others—there is very strong evidence that with regard to high blood (serum) cholesterol, the intake of saturated fats and dietary cholesterol has significant influence on increasing the risk of atherosclerotic cardiovascular diseases. Recognizing and understanding the three types of fatty acids—saturated, polyunsaturated, and monounsaturated fats—and their differing impact on blood cholesterol levels is critical in determining the implications of one's diet. Saturated fats are primarily found in meats, animal fats, and certain types of vegetable oil—palm, palm kernel, and coconut oil. Clinical, animal and epidemiologic research have determined that saturated fats tend to raise serum total and the so-called bad LDL cholesterol levels in the blood. They also tend to lower the good HDL—thought to be protective against CHD—cholesterol. Both polyunsaturated and monounsaturated fats—found in most vegetable oils, whole grains and some types of fish—tend to lower serum total levels and the bad LDL cholesterol. However, recent studies have indicated that polyunsaturated fats may also decrease good HDL cholesterol, while monounsaturated fats do not appear to lower HDL levels.

Overall fat levels in the diet are also considered to be a factor in CHD. Currently the average American daily dietary fat consumption is 37 percent of total energy intake—calories. The upper limit recommended by the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society is no more than 30 percent of daily caloric intake. Of that 30 percent, most experts recommend that half—15 percent—be monounsaturated, one third—10 percent—be polyunsaturated, and one sixth—15 percent be saturated.

The recommendation for dietary cholesterol is no more than 300 milligrams daily. Currently American diets are well above that figure at 400 to 500 milligrams per day. Since cholesterol is found only in animal products which contain saturated fat as well, it

makes sense to cut back on those food products for both reasons.

For many years, there has been very strong evidence of the link of high sodium intake with the occurrence of high blood pressure or hypertension. This chronic medical problem is, according to the Surgeon General's report, responsible for a major portion of cardiovascular disease in the United States. Table salt contains about 40 percent sodium. Although sodium is necessary in the diet, Americans on the average consume levels of this element that are far above the levels considered to be safe and necessary for normal metabolic function. The recommended intake of sodium is from 1.1 to 3.3 grams per day. The current average U.S. adult consumption of sodium is from 4 to 6 grams daily. While many Americans are aware of the need to reduce intake of sodium and are perhaps making an effort to add less salt to foods prepared in the home, most processed and prepared foods, particularly canned foods contain very high amounts of sodium.

Mr. Speaker, for these and many other important health and dietary implications, I am introducing this legislation, which I believe will help consumers make better choices in the foods they select for themselves and their families. As I stated earlier, I think most Americans are becoming increasingly aware and interested in the role of nutrition in preventing certain diseases and in maintaining overall good health. Under current regulations, I do not think there is adequate information on food labels for making these important choices. This bill will be a small, but significant step in this goal.

Mr. Speaker, I would insert the text of the bill in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 2051

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Food Labeling and Heart Disease Reduction Act of 1989".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that:

(1) Health authorities have reached a consensus that Americans should modify their diets in order to reduce their risk of serious chronic illnesses including cardiovascular diseases, including advice by—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services that Americans should avoid too much fat, saturated fat, dietary cholesterol, and sodium,

(B) the Surgeon General of the United States that most Americans should reduce consumption of fat (especially saturated fat), dietary cholesterol, and sodium,

(C) the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences that Americans should reduce total fat intake to 30 percent or less of calories, saturated fat to less than 10 percent of calories, dietary cholesterol to less than 300 milligrams daily,

and limit daily salt intake to 6 grams (2.4 grams sodium), and

(D) the National Institutes of Health that Americans should lower consumption of total fat, saturated fat, and dietary cholesterol in order to lower blood cholesterol levels, in order to reduce the risk of coronary heart disease.

(2) Current food labeling practices and regulations do not enable Americans to follow the authoritative diet and health recommendations because—

(A) nearly half of processed, packaged foods regulated by the Food and Drug Administration lack nutrition labeling,

(B) even where it exists, current nutrition labeling does not provide information about several nutrients that these recommendations highlight,

(C) current labeling uses terms and formats that many consumers find difficult to understand and use, and

(D) many labels bear nutrition and health claims that may mislead the consumer because they omit information that is critical to evaluating the claims.

SEC. 3. LABEL REQUIREMENTS.

Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(q) If it contains fat, cholesterol, or sodium unless its labeling states—

"(1) the percentage of calories from fat per serving of the food,

"(2) the amount of total fat per serving of the food and the amounts which are saturated, polyunsaturated, or monounsaturated,

"(3) the amount of sodium per serving of the food, and

"(4) the amount of cholesterol per serving of the food.

The statements specified in paragraphs (1) through (4) shall be presented in such a manner as to enable consumers to readily observe and comprehend the required disclosures and to understand the relative significance of each nutritional content disclosure in the context of the total daily diet."

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

JAPANESE BURDENSARING AND WORLD HUNGER

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the monthly news about our trade deficit with Japan is bad. The trade deficit has increased again. Relatedly, last week this Member introduced House Concurrent Resolution 91 which expresses the sense of Congress that the Government of Japan should use its foreign assistance funds to purchase United States agricultural commodities, and donate such purchases to international relief efforts to help fight world hunger.

Recently, the Japanese Government indicated its commitment to double its official development assistance from \$25 million from 1983 to 1987 to \$50 million between 1988 and 1992. Such

an increase will make Japan the largest net bilateral development assistance donor.

Japan is to be commended for its increased commitment to developmental assistance. This increased commitment by the Japanese comes at a time when 750 million people worldwide continue to suffer from moderate to severe malnutrition, and where over 9,000 people, mostly children under the age of 5 die every day from hunger-related causes.

At the same time, Japanese trade barriers to many United States agricultural commodities continue to block their entry into the Japanese market. While some of these barriers are purely protectionistic, others are rooted in deeply cultural and politically sensitive issues.

House Concurrent Resolution 91 calls upon the Japanese Government to look to the United States as the principal source of supply for food aid purposes.

Japan's use of its foreign assistance funds for the purchase of United States agricultural commodities and products, would improve United States-Japanese trade relations, increase United States agricultural exports, increase farm income, lower our trade deficit, and most importantly, help feed millions of hungry people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues' support and cosponsorship for House Concurrent Resolution 91 is requested.

H. CON. RES. 91

Whereas 750,000,000 people worldwide, more than three times the population of the United States, suffer from moderate to severe malnutrition and do not consume enough calories to perform sustained manual labor;

Whereas 9,240 people, mostly children under the age of five, die every day from hunger-related causes and others suffer brain damage due to malnutrition;

Whereas medical research documents that full economic productivity by adults and full mental development of young children both require adequate nutrition;

Whereas permanent impairment of body or mind due to chronic or temporary hunger contributes to a cycle of lowered economic productivity in which millions of individuals and families are incapable of generating sufficient income to escape from the cycle of hunger and lack of productivity;

Whereas adequate nutrition and other health measures have resulted in lowering rates of infant mortality below 50 per 1,000 during the twentieth century in countries containing over 50 percent of the world's population, and it is technically feasible to achieve such a reduction worldwide by the year 2000 through elimination of persistent hunger and other health measures;

Whereas sufficient food can be produced on a global basis to adequately feed the population of the world, to prevent brain damage due to malnutrition, and to eliminate lack of economic productivity due to hunger;

Whereas such food supplies must come from production both in the countries which are net exporters of agricultural commodities and products and also from in-

creased food production in food-deficit countries in the developing world;

Whereas development assistance in the form of food can be productively used to alleviate hunger and malnutrition among impoverished people and also as a resource to promote improvements in local agriculture, health, sanitation, education, environmental sustainability and basic infrastructure;

Whereas private voluntary groups, other nongovernmental organizations, and international organizations have experience in the design and successful administration of projects using food assistance for development-related projects and for emergency relief;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated a sustained commitment to making food available for development and relief purposes through the Public Law 480 Food for Peace and other food donation programs, totaling \$41,000,000,000 in gross value between 1954 and 1988;

Whereas the policy of the United States has been to encourage cooperation among the bilateral aid programs of various donor governments and international organizations such as the World Food Programme in pursuit of hunger alleviation and related developmental goals;

Whereas the Japanese commitment to double its official development assistance from \$25,000,000,000 between 1983 and 1987 to \$50,000,000,000 between 1988 and 1992 and to provide a larger proportion of its aid programs as grants will make Japan the largest net bilateral development assistance donor;

Whereas it is in the interest of both the United States and Japan to promote hunger alleviation, sustainable economic growth and political democracies in developing nations;

Whereas Japan has barriers to the import of certain United States agricultural commodities and products, such as rice;

Whereas there has been a lack of progress on negotiating reduced barriers to many United States commodities which would be highly competitive in an open Japanese market;

Whereas many Japanese barriers to United States agricultural commodities and products remain because they are politically and culturally sensitive;

Whereas it is also in the interest of both the United States and Japan to reduce bilateral trade tensions between the two nations, particularly in the area of agricultural trade; and

Whereas the United States' agricultural production capabilities and Japan's financial capabilities are complementary factors that must be coordinated for dramatic global progress to be made in reducing preventable deaths from hunger-related causes during the next decade: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should direct the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to encourage the Government of Japan to use a portion of its increased foreign assistance funds to significantly increase the availability of international food aid supplies through bilateral or multilateral channels to meet the needs of the world's hungry people;

(2) Japanese aid resources could be channeled to finance, directly or indirectly, long-term contracts to purchase and deliver commodities from the United States and devel-

oping country agricultural producers as donations to nongovernmental or international organizations for use in hunger alleviation projects with developmental results;

(3) during the duration of any such long-term contractual agreement, such purchases of food and agricultural commodities and products produced in the United States which are purchased by the Government of Japan for donation and delivery to international hunger relief programs should be considered as the equivalent of increased importation into Japan of the same quantities of such product for the purposes of United States Trade Law in cases where this would be of advantage to Japan;

(4) during the time period of any such Japanese purchases from the United States, the value of United States Government purchases of the same commodities for use in food aid programs under Public Law 480 should be maintained at no less than fiscal year 1989 levels; and

(5) the commodities purchased under this program should be donated to organizations equipped to ensure that the food will be available only to projects that meet the following criteria:

(A) The use of the food will either be positive or neutral in its impact on the incomes of local agricultural producers in the recipient nation;

(B) The food will be targeted for use in improving the nutritional status of impoverished and malnourished people.

(C) To the maximum extent possible, the food will be used in such programs as food-for-work, school feeding, or other programs resulting in improved smallholder agricultural productivity, health, sanitation, environmental sustainability, education or basic infrastructure as well as improved nutrition. Allowance should also be made for the monetization of up to 25 percent of the food donated for any particular project, subject to the three conditions listed above.

THE COUNTRY WAITS FOR ANSWERS FROM CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, thousands of coal miners in my district and in areas across the country are waiting to go back to work. Industry in this country is waiting for answers to the questions posed by high-sulfur coal. And communities dependent on the business produced by these sectors of our economy are waiting for revival. And what are they waiting on?

Well, if you listen to the General Accounting Office, they're waiting in part for the Department of Energy and others to get their acts together and get on with the business of clean-coal research.

The GAO recently reported on four demonstration projects funded in large part by DOE which are so far behind schedule the Department can't estimate when they might be done.

The projects are beset with any number of problems. It reads like a laundry list of bureaucracy and red-

tape. Difficulties in getting environmental permits when faced with economic problems. Difficulties in obtaining private financing, or in finding buyers for the energy. And finally problems of coordination between the various groups participating in the project, problems complying with environmental requirements and the need to cut costs.

These four projects are notable because they have the highest rate of Federal money. Mr. Keith Fultz, a GAO energy expert, says he wonders if because they have the most Federal money if that means their commitment isn't as great. I wonder too.

I wonder about the future of districts like mine where unemployment in the coal fields runs almost beyond the imagination, where mines are working at half the work force they once did and people are leaving in search of something better or holding on to the hope that things will get better. Where do they draw this hope from? First, from their families, where coal mining is a tradition and an honored profession. Second, they draw it from a belief in the way of life we enjoy in this country, where someone with the willingness to try and with a little help can make a difference. That's what many of them see in clean-coal technology, an answer lying in wait for the right combination of brainpower and willpower. That they have to keep waiting aggravates and disappoints them, and I share their feeling.

I look around my district and see towns that once bustled with activity now struggling to hang on. Their dependence on coal mining and the economic activity it creates is impossible to miss, and although we can encourage diversification and alternatives to this lifestyle, we cannot ignore the vast resources which lie underground waiting to be discovered. The coal is plentiful, there's no argument about that. We have the work force and the means to bring it from the earth. No one can argue that relying more on a domestic resource would not improve our balance of trade, reduce our reliance on foreign energy, and give hope and opportunity to millions of working Americans. Our only argument seems to be with bringing the research and technology on line to make it all happen.

My colleagues, we are spending millions on clean coal technology, looking for answers that will help solve our environmental and economic problems at the same time. We must in all fairness applaud the joint ventures between Government and private industry. That partnership is critical to bringing this research out of the lab and into the marketplace. We should not be critical of the alliance, but we must be watchful, and if need be critical, when the projects which hold such promise

fall so far behind we can't even predict when their work will be ready.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently considering measures to limit the effects of acid rain, and although it remains to many unproven, some establish a link between burning high sulphur coal and acid rain. As we move in this direction we must also include funding for clean coal research. The Federal Government has a distinct and important role in promoting the research and application of technology of clean coal. I hope the delays I am bringing to your attention today, which are not due to the failure of the product but rather the process, do not preclude us from aggressively searching for answers in the future.

The country is waiting, and growing impatient with the length of the wait.

I wish to enter this recent Associated Press account of the story and my remarks today for the RECORD.

GAO REPORT: SEVEN OF NINE CLEAN COAL PROJECTS BEHIND SCHEDULE

(By Katherine Rizzo)

WASHINGTON.—Four of the nine clean coal technology projects financed by the federal government are so far behind schedule the Energy Department can't estimate when they might be done.

Three other projects have experienced less serious delays, according to the department and the General Accounting Office.

But in testimony Thursday before a House subcommittee looking into whether the money can be put to better use, GAO energy expert Keith Fultz said it is too soon to tell whether the delays "will affect the timing of the commercial availability of the clean coal technologies."

The government, utilities and other private industries are sharing the cost of developing new ways of burning coal so the plentiful fuel can provide more power with less pollution.

Gasses from coal-burning power plants help cause both acid rain and the greenhouse effect, or overall warming of the globe.

In his report to the Energy and Power Subcommittee, Fultz blamed coordination, equipment and financing problems for delays in demonstration projects that account for about \$8 million of the \$42 million spent so far by the federal government.

Four clean coal technology projects "are in trouble at this point," he said.

Ohio Ontario Clean Fuels Inc.'s coal-oil coprocessing project at Warren, Ohio was about 13 months off track because of difficulty in getting environmental permits when it experienced economic problems. The Energy Department could not provide new estimates for when the project might be completed.

Energy International Inc.'s underground coal gasification project at Rawlins, Wyo., has postponed its completion date by 15 months because the company has been unable to get private financing.

M.W. Kellogg Co.'s advanced coal gasification project proposed for New York is nine months off schedule because of problems finding buyers for the power the project would generate.

Energy and Environment Research Corp.'s gas reburning project was delayed for a year because of problems coordinating

with utilities participating in the project, complying with environmental requirements and needed cost-cutting measures.

The GAO is concerned that the clean coal demonstration projects having the most difficulty are the ones in which the federal government has agreed to pick up a large share of the costs, Fultz said.

"These four projects have the highest rate of federal money," he said. "You wonder if because they have less non-federal money that that somehow means their commitment isn't as great."

J. Allen Wampler, the Energy Department's assistant secretary for Fossil Energy, said decisions on the future of those projects are expected by June 30.

Wampler conceded the clean coal program's results so far "are mixed with both progress and problems."

However, the agency learned a lot in the first round of the program and will apply those lessons as it continues, he told the congressional panel.

"We did not require a great deal of financial information (from project sponsors) which most certainly was a mistake," he said.

Both the GAO and the Energy Department said they don't have those kinds of worries about the largest amount of money spent so far—\$25 million on a demonstration project in Brilliant, Ohio.

The federal government's total share of that project has been set at \$60 million, and though it has fallen seven months behind schedule, a \$10 million cost overrun is to be picked up by the sponsoring utility, the GAO report said.

"That project has slipped a little in time but is sound," Wampler said.

Fultz agreed a seven-month delay is not out of line considering the size of the endeavor at the American Electric Power Service Corp. facility.

Fultz also told the panel that efforts to impose new tougher limits on smokestack pollution could have a big effect on the long-term clean coal technology projects.

If Congress forces power plants to lower emissions levels before the new technologies are ready for widespread commercial use, power plants would be forced to put their money into the pollution control devices that are available now, he said.

The nine projects examined by GAO were the first financed by the clean coal program, which later was reorganized under an agreement with Canada.

As part of the reorganization, the United States agreed that the second round of clean coal financing would favor projects that would reduce acid rain. DOE expects to sign agreements for 16 new projects by October for about \$537 million in federal aid and \$800 million in private funds.

The federal government has made a long-range \$2.5 billion commitment to the clean coal program.

Taxpayers in coal-rich Ohio are helping that state's programs with a \$100 million bond issue.

WHAT IS AN ASSAULT WEAPON?

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, the American public is being hoodwinked by the antigun crowd.

Hoodwinked into thinking that semiautomatic firearms are responsible for drug murders.

Hoodwinked into believing that semiautomatic firearms are evil instruments used to kill school children.

Hoodwinked into believing that if we outlaw semiautomatic firearms we will cure the drug problem.

Hoodwinked into believing that we will cure the Nation of the judicial ills that plague the system and that should put and keep criminals behind bars.

Hoodwinked by the antigun crowd using emotionalism of the moment to do away with legitimate and safe semiautomatic firearms.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 17, 1989]

WHAT IS AN "ASSAULT WEAPON"?

Sen. Howard Metzenbaum is pushing the "Assault Weapon Control Act of 1989," which would forbid law-abiding Americans from buying semiautomatic firearms defined as "assault weapons." He says he wants to keep semiautomatics out of the hands of drug lords and murderers like Patrick Purdy, the convict who sprayed a Stockton, Calif., schoolyard with semiautomatic gunfire, killing five children. But his bill won't stop these crimes. It would restrict private ownership of an entire class of firearms without addressing the most glaring weakness in present gun-control laws, which is that hardened criminals serve no time for their gun crimes.

The bill seems reasonable, banning guns Arnold Schwarzenegger might use in movies like "The Terminator": the AK-47, the MAC-10, the "Street Sweeper" riot-control shotgun and others. It would require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to register all "assault weapons" and demand that prospective buyers submit to BATF a mug shot, fingerprints and signed approval from the local police chief. The bill also requires the police to confiscate all detachable, more-than-10-round ammunition clips.

But what appears reasonable often isn't, like the bill's circular definition of assault weapons: "all other semiautomatic firearms which are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General, to be assault weapons."

Since all semiautomatics are "substantially identical," to use the bill's language, all firearms using this 100-year-old technology could be defined as "assault weapons." Yet the BATF says there is no real definition of "assault weapon" and that Purdy used "a semiautomatic that, except for its deadly military appearance, is no different from other semiautomatic rifles."

Enforcing the Metzenbaum bill would be a nightmare. Most semiautomatic owners keep 5- or 10-shot clips that don't carry serial numbers or other identification. Since Americans own 20-30 million semiautomatics, the police might have to round up as many as 100 million clips.

The bill also offers the false promise that it will cut down on mayhem in our midst. The fact is that "assault weapons" aren't used in very many crimes. In 1987, only 4 percent of homicides nationwide were committed with rifles of any kind, and in Washington, D.C. in 1987, only one murder was committed with a rifle—a huge class of firearms ranging from .22-caliber guns to high-powered, big-game rifles to Uzis and AK-47s.

Despite common perceptions to the contrary, many semiautomatic firearms really are used for hunting, and in giving BATF the power to ban them, the bill would punish sportsmen rather than drug lords. If Mr. Metzenbaum wants to curb the Patrick Purdys among us, he ought to address our real gun-control problem, which is that we don't even lock away the gun-toting criminals we catch.

□ 1650

MAYBE IT IS TIME FOR US TO CHANGE DIRECTION. WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE SAVINGS RATHER THAN PENALIZING THEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was tax day in America. Yesterday was the deadline for millions of Americans to file with the Internal Revenue Service in our voluntary reporting system.

Some interesting things happened on yesterday. Yesterday, while adults all over America were filing their taxes, young adults were likewise in many instances filing their first IRS form.

My daughter was one of them. My daughter is 18 years old, she is a student at LSU, she is a first-year income earner and filed her first income tax.

This last year my daughter earned \$2,700 in income working at a part-time job in Baton Rouge.

Now the good news for my daughter was that in our Internal Revenue Code we allow young people such as her to earn up to \$3,000 without having to pay income taxes on that \$3,000.

So the good news she discovered when she filed the return was that she owed no Federal income taxes on the amount of money she earned.

The bad news was that she discovered that on the some \$60 she had earned as interest on her savings, which her father had encouraged her to accumulate, she owed a tax. She asked me, "Dad, what kind of a message is this? I thought you wanted me to save money. Is the Federal Government telling me it doesn't want me to save money? Had I not had that savings account and not earned that interest on that savings account, but spent that money, instead, I would have not had a tax liability."

I said, "Kristie, you are right. There are some mixed signals here, Kristie."

Maybe it is time we in the Congress take heed of the fact that we have created some mixed signals for Americans.

Newsweek magazine, I think it was March 12, published an article about our Tax Code and spoke about how, indeed, we ought to line up our income

and our expenses as best to avoid taxes legitimately as regards our children. In that article there was a statement that Congress must hate children who save money. They cited the very same example I just gave you about my young daughter.

The point being that for a long time in America we have built a Tax Code that discourages citizens from saving money. We penalize people when they do what fathers and mothers try to do with their children, encourage them to save money.

We, instead, encourage people to accumulate debt. We give deductions for interest on houses, we give deductions for interest accumulated for business purposes. We even still allow some personal interest deductions in the Tax Code although we are gradually phasing those out.

On the other hand, when some one saves money we tax it. In the case of my young daughter we tax it even though we do not tax her income.

Something is wrong with that kind of a signal. Maybe it is the reason that of all the industrialized nations of the world Americans save less of their disposable income than anyone else. Maybe it is the reason that our rate of savings has declined to a dismal 2½ percent this year. Maybe it is the reason why other industrialized nations the rate of savings in France, for example, is something like 9 percent, Germany something like 12 to 15, in Japan something like 22 to 28 percent, in Taiwan 34 percent.

Maybe there is a reason those nations are accumulating savings, so much that they are now providing capital to America, so much so that Japan and Germany have literally become the Standard & Poors of America deciding whether our credit is good; so much so that we have become the biggest debtor nation in the world; so much so that our savings rate is so low in America that interest rates are beginning to rise dramatically again.

Maybe it is time for us to change direction. Maybe it is time for us in America to say to Americans instead of penalizing you for saving we are going to encourage you.

In Germany there is a plan on the books that goes so far as to match the first \$600 of savings that a person will accumulate in savings. I am not suggesting that we go that far.

But I am suggesting that it is time in America for us to say that as a general principle we will encourage our citizens to save money by not taxing a considerable portion of the interest earned on those savings accounts.

So I have offered a bill today, H.R. 2021, called the Save, America Act. Save, America, it might just be able to do it if you think about what it could do. This bill would for the first time provide for Americans the right to

save money and to earn interest tax free on those accounts.

How does it work?

First of all it targets those savings accounts to our troubled S&L's and other federally insured accounts at banks and credit unions. It says in effect to every taxpaying citizen that if you are willing to begin accumulating money on your account we will give you up to \$5,000 of tax-free interest on accounts you invest in federally insured banks and S&L's and credit unions provided you invest them in passbook savings, the low-interest-yielding accounts that have formed the basis of much of our low-interest money for housing in America.

H.R. 2021, I invite the other Members' attention to it, I invite America's attention to it, the Save, America Act, the first attempt to give Americans the incentive to save in our troubled Federal savings and loans, insured banks, and credit unions. Join with me, if you will, to provide this incentive not only to my daughter Kristie but to all Americans to begin building savings accounts in our great Nation.

The text of H.R. 2021 is as follows:

H.R. 2021

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE: CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Save, America Act of 1989".

(b) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) at alarming rates, depositors are fleeing ailing federally insured savings and loans, compounding the challenge to save insolvent and marginally solvent thrifts by threatening even the strongest elements of the industry;

(2) the decline in the national savings rate from the mid 1970's level of 7.9 percent to the 1985-1987 rate of 2.1 percent increases the risk of recession and ultimately adversely affects growth in the standard of living;

(3) taxation of interest earnings on savings accounts penalizes those who choose to save for their future;

(4) because of the borrowing which is necessary to fund the growing Federal budget deficit, the Federal Government is absorbing an ever-increasing share of the funds available in the credit markets which decreases the amount of such funds which are available to the American consumer and increases the rates of interest at which any such funds are made available; and

(5) the United States has had, in recent years, the lowest per capita rate of personal savings among the world's industrial nations and the lowest rate of personal savings by the average American since 1949.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to minimize the amount of Federal funds necessary for the savings and loan rescue through encouraging the infusion of private funds into savings accounts in federally insured financial institutions; and

(2) to increase both the national savings rate and the level of available private capital for investment, through a tax incentive

for savings in federally insured low yielding passbook accounts.

SEC. 2. INTEREST EARNED ON CERTAIN PASSBOOK SAVINGS ACCOUNTS EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME OF THE TAXPAYER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to interest on certain savings certificates) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 128. INTEREST ON PASSBOOK SAVINGS ACCOUNTS IN FEDERALLY INSURED INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, gross income does not include the amount received or accrued during the taxable year as qualified interest.

"(b) MAXIMUM DOLLAR AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount excludable under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed \$5,000 (\$10,000 in the case of a joint return).

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) QUALIFIED INTEREST.—The term 'qualified interest' means amounts earned as interest (whether or not such amounts are designated as interest) on amounts on deposit in a passbook savings account in a qualified institution.

"(2) PASSBOOK SAVINGS ACCOUNT.—The term 'passbook savings account' means any account which is established, pursuant to a written agreement, in a statement, book-entry, or other form and into which deposits are made (or any other form of deposit which is represented by a transferable or nontransferable, or a negotiable or nonnegotiable, certificate, instrument, passbook, statement, or other document and which may be withdrawn only upon presentation of any such document) to the extent that, with respect to any deposit into such account (or any such deposit)—

"(A) the rate of interest on such deposit for any period between consecutive auctions of 52-week Treasury bills does not exceed the average investment yield for the first of such auctions reduced by 3 percentage points, and

"(B) no limitation is imposed on the amount, time, or manner of such deposit, or any withdrawal of such deposit, other than any limitation imposed by or pursuant to any act of Congress.

"(3) QUALIFIED INSTITUTION.—The term 'qualified institution' means—

"(A) a bank (as defined in section 581),

"(B) a mutual savings bank, cooperative bank, domestic building and loan association, or other savings institution chartered and supervised as a savings and loan or similar institution under Federal or State law, or

"(C) a credit union,

the deposits or accounts in which are insured under Federal law."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 265(a) of such Code is amended by striking out "or to purchase or carry any certificate to the extent the interest on such certificate is excludable under section 128" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to purchase shares or make deposits the interest on which is qualified interest (as defined in section 128(c)(1)) to the extent such interest is excludable from gross income under section 128".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 128 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 128. Interest on passbook savings accounts in federally insured institutions."

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PHILLIP H. WEAVER, OF NEBRASKA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. **BEREUTER**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **BEREUTER**. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to inform my colleagues in the Congress of the death of one of the former Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Former Congressman Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, NE, passed away Sunday afternoon.

It is especially poignant for me to make this announcement since Mr. Weaver held the seat in Congress that I now occupy. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1954 as a Republican from Nebraska's First Congressional District and served honorably until 1963. Actually, he was elected from the old First District that covered much of the State south of the Platte River when the State had four House districts. He lost that seat only as a result of redistricting when he and another Republican colleague were placed in the same district.

While in Congress Mr. Weaver served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Appropriations Committee where he served on its important Subcommittee on Defense. Each of these committees offered Representative Phil Weaver the opportunity to serve both the interests of his constituents and the national interest.

After leaving Congress, Mr. Weaver held a series of high posts in the administrations of Republican and Democratic Presidents. He was a special assistant in the Department of Agriculture during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and remained during part of the Nixon administration.

In 1973 he retired from the Federal Government to return to his home in Falls City. He returned to Nebraska to resume his family's business interests. In 1975 he received an appointment to the Nebraska Liquor Control Commission which he chaired for 4 years.

Phil Weaver represented the best of Nebraska traditions and values. He was born and raised in Falls City. He learned to respect the importance of government and public service early in his life. His father, Arthur J. Weaver, served as Governor of Nebraska in 1929 and 1930. His grandfather, A.J. Weaver, served in Congress in the 1880's.

Upon graduating from the University of Nebraska in 1942, and receiving

an ROTC commission in the U.S. Army, Phil Weaver served with distinction in World War II. He was awarded the Bronze Star for his military service and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Army Reserve Forces.

Throughout his professional and public life, Mr. Weaver was identified with organizations and activities that sought to promote Nebraska and improve the lives of the people he served so well. He will be buried with full military honors tomorrow, April 19, 1989, in his home community of Falls City, NE. He is survived by his wife of 43 years, Betty Jane Burner Weaver, five sons, a brother, two sisters, and seven grandchildren.

Well-done distinguished former colleague Phillip H. Weaver! Thank you for your dedicated public service. You made a difference for the better in your community, State, and Nation.

I did not have the privilege of knowing this fine man but I know that the citizens of Falls City, Richardson County, and southeast Nebraska held him in high esteem. He served them honorably and well in Washington, DC, but returned home to southeast Nebraska in 1973 where he lived the remainder of his life. He will be missed by all who knew him. My sincere condolences are extended to his wife and family.

□ 1700

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **PRICE**). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. **ANNUNZIO**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. **ANNUNZIO** addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. **JONES**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **JONES** of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the first gentlemen I met when I came to the Congress in 1966 was Turner Robertson, who was at that time, chief page. I was not aware of the importance of this position at that time, but later, due to subsequent events, it proved to be a most vital position, to protect the prestige and dignity of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Robertson was always most courteous and friendly with all the Members and their staffs, and most helpful to me in those early days.

On Friday, April 21, 1989, Turner will celebrate his 80th birthday, and so along with his many friends, I wish him health and happiness on that day as well as many years to come.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. **BENTLEY**] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mrs. **BENTLEY** addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. **OWENS**] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. **OWENS** of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEFICIT REDUCTION GUARANTEE ACT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. **FRENZEL**] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **FRENZEL**. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Deficit Reduction Guarantee Act to grant the President enhanced rescission powers in the event that Congress is unable to achieve a balanced budget as required under the Gramm-Rudman law. This legislation, which would only go into effect if our national debt increases above proscribed levels, would give the President an additional tool to enforce the Gramm-Rudman's goal of a balanced budget in 1993.

Since the enactment of Gramm-Rudman, Congress has by hook or by crook, by smoke or by mirrors, found a way to meet—or delay—the required deficit targets. Unfortunately, the measures used to meet the targets and to avoid sequestration, have not translated into much actual deficit reduction. For example, in fiscal year 1989, CBO estimates that our true deficit will be \$171 billion, \$34 billion above the GRH target.

The problem with the current system of sequestration is that its power to enforce disappears after the deficit target is met at the beginning of the fiscal year. Congress needs an enforcement mechanism which, unlike sequestration, cannot be circumvented by budget gimmickry and supplemental appropriations bills.

The legislation I am introducing would provide such an enforcement mechanism by making the President's rescission authority contingent on the actual level of Federal debt held by the public. The GRH deficit targets are \$136 billion in 1989, \$100 billion in 1990, \$64 billion in 1991, \$32 billion in 1992, and zero in 1993. Adding these amounts to the accumulated public debt as of fiscal year 1988 yields \$2.378 trillion—the amount designated in the bill as the trigger for enhanced rescission authority.

Once the designated level of public debt is reached, this legislation would grant the President authority to rescind appropriated budget authority by sending a special message to the Congress detailing each item of rescission. The rescission would automatically become law unless Congress passes, within 45 days, a resolution of disapproval. The President would have the option of vetoing this resolution.

Unlike current law where Congress can avoid a Presidential rescission simply by ignoring it, this bill would force Congress to vote to preserve rescinded appropriations. Fiscal dis-

cipline demands that if Congress cannot meet its budget goals, it should not be able to stonewall Presidential attempts to control excess spending.

Failure to reach our legally mandated goal of a balanced budget by 1993 will be a sure indication that the current balance of power for Federal budgeting is inadequate to run a sound fiscal policy. This legislation would provide the President a necessary tool to ensure that we meet our own deficit reduction goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. LANTOS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goss) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PASHAYAN, for 60 minutes, on April 25.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LANTOS, for 15 minutes each day, on April 26 and 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goss) to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. DELAY.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. HENRY.

Mr. TAUKE in three instances.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. BATEMAN.

Mr. RITTER in two instances.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. BLAZ.

Mr. HYDE in two instances.

Mr. INHOFE.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. MRAZEK in two instances.

Mr. MATUSI.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. TAUZIN.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. STAGGERS.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. DARDEN in two instances.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. WHEAT.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. JENKINS.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating May 1989 as "Older Americans Month."

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1989

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 97 of the 101st Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Tuesday, April 25, 1989.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 97, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 25, 1989, at 12 noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, Jill L. Long, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the 101st Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Hon. JILL L. LONG, Fourth District, Indiana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

999. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the national defense stockpile requirements report for 1989, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-5; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1000. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Rochester Institute of Technology Overhead Study for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4332; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1001. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Charles Edgar Redman, of Florida, as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to Sweden; by Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands, as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to Argentina, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1002. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize a multiyear economic assistance program for the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1003. A letter from the Staff Assistant, U.S. Commissioner, Delaware River Basin Commission, transmitting a report on the evaluation of the Commission's internal control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C.

3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1004. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner, Susquehanna River Basin Commission, transmitting a report on the evaluation of the Commission's internal control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1005. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the tenth annual report of the Board's activities for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1209(b); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1006. A letter from the Secretary, Veterans Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the provisions relating to refinancing loans and manufactured housing loans to veterans, to modify the procedures for the sale of loans by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1007. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's request for an extension on its legislative proposal to refine the Medicare Prospective Payment System, pursuant to Public Law 99-509, section 9305(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1008. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's request for a 6 month extension on its findings concerning reorganization proposals to improve management of agriculture international trade activities due April 30, 1989, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 5214; jointly, to the Committee on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

1009. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer administration of bridges and causeways over navigable waters from the Secretary of Transportation to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2072. A bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes (Rep. 101-30. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. APFLEGATE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr.

ECKART, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 2021. A bill to provide that interest earned on certain passbook savings accounts shall be excluded from gross income of the taxpayer as an incentive to taxpayers to increase savings in local banks and savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 2022. A bill to establish certain categories of nationals of the Soviet Union and nationals of Indochina presumed to be subject to persecution and to provide for adjustment to refugee status of certain Soviet and Indochinese parolees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PENNY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 2023. A bill to limit the liability of certain persons who, without compensation, transport human organs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAZ:

H.R. 2024. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the live performing arts rights given by section 8(e) of such act to employers and employees in similarly situated industries, to give to such employers and performers the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COELHO (for himself and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 2026. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to prohibit the importation of kiwifruit, peaches, pears, nectarines, and plums that do not comply with any grade, size, quality, and maturity provisions of a marketing order applicable under such act to the respective kind of fruit produced in the United States or with comparable restrictions promulgated under such act; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 2027. A bill to provide that employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority who are covered by a collective bargaining agreement shall not be subject to any regulations which take employee efficiency or performance ratings into account in determining the order of retention of competing employees in a reduction in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. POSHARD):

H.R. 2028. A bill to amend the Act of May 17, 1954, relating to the Jefferson National

Expansion Memorial, to eliminate the acreage limitation on park extension, to allow the acquisition of State lands by means other than donation, to authorize increased funding for land acquisition for the east St. Louis portion of the memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2029. A bill to disallow the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases with respect to a geographical area located in the Pacific Ocean off the coastline of Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2030. A bill to provide for an additional district judge in the district of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Ms. OAKAR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. DYMALLY):

H.R. 2031. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia and Government Operations.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 2032. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for demonstration programs for joint nursing undergraduate education under which the costs incurred by a hospital under such a program shall be allowable as reasonable costs under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and to clarify such title to permit a nursing education program operated by a corporation under common control with a hospital to be treated as approved educational activities of such hospital; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2033. A bill to amend accounting procedures under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide the President with enhanced rescission authority at such time as the debt of the U.S. Government held by the public reaches \$2,378,000,000,000; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself (by request), Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. TAUKE):

H.R. 2035. A bill to reauthorize programs under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 2036. A bill to correct the tariff classification of linear motion guides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. CARR, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. NOWAK, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. HILER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EM-

ERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. COLLINS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MOODY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FISH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. ROUEMA, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of amounts paid for employee educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATCHER (for himself, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia):

H.R. 2038. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to release a reversionary interest in certain land in Clay County, GA; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois):

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to improve the delivery of services to hard-to-serve adults and to youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 2040. A bill to extend eligibility for the Indian Claims Commission expert witness loan fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 2041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow income from the sale of certain used automobiles to be computed on the installment sales method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONTZ:

H.R. 2042. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to allow producers to provide the appropriate county committees with actual yields for the 1989 and subsequent crop years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONTZ (for himself, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 2043. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program to improve the collections of defaulted student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. RIDGE):

H.R. 2044. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct pilot programs for the provision of assisting animals to quadriplegic and hearing-impaired veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 2045. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to develop and install a flood warning system for the Santa Clara River, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties, CA; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2046. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to provide flood flight assistance to the Ventura County Flood Control District with respect to Santa Paula Creek, Ventura, CA; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 2047. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCANDLESS:

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 to change the years in which the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries meets; to require that pay adjustments under that section be approved by recorded vote; and to delay the effective date of any such pay adjustments; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service Rules, and House Administration.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 2049. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use the most current data available in updating the hospital wage level adjustment factor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. APPLE-GATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PARRIS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 2050. A bill to permit certain coal miners and their survivors to have their claims reviewed under the Black Lung Benefits Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe certain requirements with respect to the labeling of food products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MRAZEK:

H.R. 2052. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to control emissions of dioxin from certain resource recovery points and municipal waste incinerators; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. BROOKS):

H.R. 2053. A bill to amend Public Law 100-478 to ensure the development of effective sea turtle conservation regulations by delaying the effectiveness of certain regulations until after the completion of a study pertaining to such conservation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act to authorize grants for library and information technology enhancement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JAMES, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MICHEL):

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Medicare supplemental premium and certain Medicare part B benefits added by the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2056. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to continue to require geographic toll rate averaging in the regulation of interstate long distance telephone rates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. FISH, and Mr. SYNAR):

H.R. 2057. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code, the bankruptcy code, regarding swap agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2058. A bill to abrogate off-reservation, usufructuary rights of Indian tribes to hunt, fish, and gather in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHUMWAY (for himself Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr.

HANSEN, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide that owner-operated mines shall be exempt from certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York (for herself, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 2060. A bill to amend the Internal revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for any removal or liability cost attributable to an oil spill from a vessel in navigable waters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CARPER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PALONE, Mr. BRENNAN, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 2061. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act through fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H.R. 2062. A bill to establish conditions to be imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the protection of employees in certain rail transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES:

H.R. 2063. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require incinerators located in nonattainment areas to periodically reduce emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to increase and extend the authorization of appropriations for the career guidance and counseling program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. FUSTER):

H.R. 2065. A bill to provide for studies and planning activities for improvement of tropical forest management, including forest management of insular areas and jurisdictions and public lands of the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 2066. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in Nevada as wilderness, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 2067. A bill to transfer certain legal real property to the city of North Las Vegas, NV; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 2068. A bill to establish a federally sponsored program for the restoration, conservation, and management of Onondaga Lake in Onondaga County, NY, and to provide for the sharing of costs of such clean-up, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 2069. A bill to delay implementation of the Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 for 2 years; jointly, to the Committees on

Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution designating December 21, 1989, as a national day of mourning for the victims of the crash of Pan American Airways Flight 103 and expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should take all appropriate and necessary actions to identify the cause and perpetrators of the crash; jointly, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution to designate the last full week of October, October 22 through October 28, 1989, and the last full week of October hereafter as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOGGS (for herself and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution providing for participation by delegations of Members of both Houses of Congress in ceremonies to be held in April 1989 in New York City marking the 200th anniversaries of the implementation of the Constitution as the form of government of the United States, the convening of the First Congress, the inauguration of President George Washington, and the proposal of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House from Tuesday, April 18, 1989, until Tuesday, April 25, 1989, and a conditional adjournment of the Senate from Wednesday, April 19, or Thursday, April 20, or Friday, April 21, or Saturday, April 22, 1989, until Monday, May 1, 1989; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in favor of the more equitable and more uniform treatment of federally funded and federally administered retirement programs for purposes of any deficit-reduction measures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. NOWAK (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PAXON):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Buffalo, NY, should host the 1993 summer World University Games; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON. (for himself and Mr. BERUTER):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution condemning the deliberate and systematic human rights violations by the Government of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 131. Resolution electing Representative GRANT of Florida to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 132. Resolution electing a member of the Joint Committee on Printing; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H. Res. 133. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the bombing of Pan American flight 103; and the steps that should be taken to ensure the future safety of airline passengers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. NEAL of North Carolina:

H. Res. 134. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal excise tax rates should not be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

69. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to the Federal highway trust fund, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2070. A bill for the relief of the estate of Woodrow Charles Herman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Catherine Anne Bardole a.k.a. Kathleen Bardole and her minor children, Lisa Anne Farley and Elaine Mary Farley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 8: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 14: Mr. HAYES of Illinois and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 15: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 22: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 41: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 58: Mr. BILLIRAKIS.

H.R. 60: Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DAN-NEMEYER, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT.

H.R. 63: Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DYSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 71: Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 81: Mr. WOLF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 91: Mr. COYNE and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 118: Mr. GOSS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 242: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 283: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 303: Mr. INHOPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. SARPALUIS.

H.R. 461: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 467: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 537: Mr. COYNE and Mrs. SCHROEDER.
H.R. 572: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 595: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 622: Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 623: Mr. BLILEY and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 628: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 664: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 672: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. BATES.

H.R. 719: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 765: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BATES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 774: Mr. STOKES, Mr. LaFALCE, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 794: Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 796: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 806: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BATES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 819: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 832: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 833: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 906: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 930: Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 939: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 952: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 956: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 963: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 970: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 973: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 987: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 993: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. DYALLY.

H.R. 995: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1025: Mr. FAWELL and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1044: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1058: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 1060: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1109: Mr. HERTEL and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 1131: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. PENNY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1161: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. PENNY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr.

DARDEN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HENRY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 1166: Mr. GORDON and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1167: Mr. GORDON and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1180: Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 1190: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1196: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1232: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1236: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1248: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1276: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1289: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1307: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1383: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. WISE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1393: Mr. COYNE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DYALLY, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1425: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1429: Mr. TORRES, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. MRZEK.

H.R. 1436: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1461: Mr. PRICE, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RAY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

H.R. 1469: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1472: Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1475: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. STUMP, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MACHTELEY, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1491: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. ROE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. LENT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BATES, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 1515: Mr. BAKER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1540: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1544: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1560: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1561: Mr. BATES, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 1563: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 1574: Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1587: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1599: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1601: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DORNAN of Califor-

nia, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 1602: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1605: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HILER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1641: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1659: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1682: Mr. CONTE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1687: Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 1691: Mr. DYALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1757: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1782: Mr. DORNAN of California and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1867: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1918: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PARRIS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DELUMS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1935: Mr. EVANS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. AuCOIN.

H.R. 2015: Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.J. Res. 35: Mr. STUMP, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BATES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.J. Res. 136: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.J. Res. 147: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. COYNE, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 150: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RAY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SABO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.J. Res. 168: Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 186: Mr. GOSS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. SHUMWAY and Mr. FAZIO.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. ROE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 207: Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DAVIS, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.J. Res. 208: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr.

LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. COYNE and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. WHITTAKER and Mr. STANGELAND.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. YATES, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

H. Res. 104: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H. Res. 106: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 115: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H. Res. 120: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Res. 129: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. ENGLISH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1493: Mr. HATCHER.

H.J. Res. 125: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.